

it. Or is he merely upset that his political perspective and his own position of privilege have been challenged? Open your eyes, Darren! Men at York do not constitute an oppressed group.

From his "realistic male perspective," Wilson also suggests that "militant feminism" is responsible for the current anti-feminist backlash. This rhetoric is not new; feminists are quite inured to such victim-blaming attacks. Why examine the role of the media, or the fears of the boys on Bay Street, when the easier target is the Women's Movement itself.

Wilson claims that attempts to reclaim the language, such as the words "womyn" and "herstory," are "inflammatory" and do not "advance the cause of feminism," but serve "only to antagonize men." If language reform is your idea of militant politics, Darren, you've got more shocks to come.

Wilson is correct when he states that "the etymology of the word 'history' makes no reference to gender." However, having worked as T.A. for Linguistics 2410, "Language and Sex," for the last four years, I must disabuse him of the notion that feminist linguists have ever claimed that the word "history" was sexist. Feminist historians, however, have quite convincingly demonstrated that the discipline of history has rendered women invisible. The term "herstory" was thus coined as a witty pun (yes, Darren, feminists do have a sense of humour) on the coincidental similarity of the first three letters of the word "history" and the spelling of the third person singular masculine possessive pronoun. "Herstory" is a highly specific term used to describe a feminist study of the past which is woman-centred and woman-positive and thus departs significantly from the androcentric mainstream discipline of "history."

While Wilson continues to spout his paternalistic advice from such a position of ignorance, he cannot be surprised when feminist activists tell him to use the door marked "EXIT."

Sincerely,
Jan Darby

Wayne's article pretentious

Dear Editor,

Re: "Catchphrase Culture Spawns Unfunny Jokes" (*Excalibur*, Feb 26/92) Perhaps I should be grateful (not) to Mr. Nayman for taking the time to explain the basics of comedy to me in his analysis. Leaving aside the issue that he is factually incorrect in his article by implying that the use of "not" is a plug for the movie (The use of "not" and the laughter it generates were a regular occurrence on *Wayne's World* long before the idea for a movie was conceived) there are some problematic assertions in the article.

Everyone is free to take a shot at pop culture and there is much to criticize, however, your article worries me. My concern is that pseudo-intellectual know-it-alls like yourself will actually gain a wide reaching audience so one day we will all be sitting around watching Allister Cooke on PBS and making subtle jokes that nobody understands. This is an ominous implication for human interaction.

Your critique of the comedy in *Wayne's World* reminds me of the anal-retentive station manager in *Good morning Vietnam* critiquing the on air style of Adrian Cronauer. My point is that in lamenting the decline of thought because of television and "catchphrasism" you are criticizing the writer's expression because you feel that it is lazy and not up to your own pretentious standards.

To those of us who do find Wayne and Garth's antics somewhat amusing we also see in their characters a reflection of the decline of society you allude to in your article. Maybe you should not be so quick to denigrate *Wayne's World* until you look for a subtler interpretation that you missed. Your pompous



intellect was so offended by the harmless antics of two teenagers who are an interpretive expression of today's youth, maybe you failed to get the point.

Good writers know the rules and know how to break them, yet you imply that good writing should be deep and "clever" (who knows what your idea of clever is). For someone who called *Existere* pretentious (*Excal*, Oct. 16/91) your own writing style ("why do I not like it," paragraph 7) isn't exactly down to earth.

Sincerely,
Matt Clarke,
Fourth year History student.

Sex and AIDS a moral issue

Dear Editor,

Re: "How safe sex became anti-sex" (*Excalibur*, Feb. 26/92)

I'll begin with the title — How Safe Sex Became Anti-Sex. Please. Our Western society is about as anti-sex as Cheers' Sam Malone, and at least he's entertaining. As for Darby's claim that we're living through a strong political swing to the right, it seems to me we're still in the middle (the dangerous side of) a swing to the left. And we'll pay for this, just as we have suffered from "severe rightism."

Marriage and morality are connected to AIDS prevention, because AIDS prevention very often relates to sexual activity. Surely if sex can hurt or kill you it's a moral issue. Maybe Darby's attack on morality is really sophisticated self-justification.

The overtones of this article suggest that human beings are unable to control their sexual behaviour and that any lifestyle of chastity is irrational. Darby mistakes licence for freedom.

I wonder if Darby would be less shy to publicly bad-mouth any rabbi or feminist guru (both of who issue moral pronouncements), the way she does the Pope.

For the most part, the rest of the insert wasn't much better. Billy Bragg's imagination would be wasted if he took courses at York where "getting off" is as close as the nearest university paper stand. Such a view of human sexuality gave me one big condom-proof headache... probably because I'm just repressed and puritanical.

Zoe Romanowsky.

Money first, then safety

Dear Editor,

Yesterday, I left my car lights on. It was 10:40 pm and I had paid for reserved parking because I knew I'd be leaving late.

The grounds department refused to

give me a boost because I didn't have \$5.00. The man asked me if I had a cheque, and when I didn't he said, and I quote, "I have to return with some money — sorry I can't help you." and he drove away.

At a school where a girl was raped the night before in a parking lot, did this man expect me to sleep in my car? Or perhaps walk to Jane and Finch and wait for the banks to open in the morning?

The more time I spend at this school, the more I am convinced this school hates students and loves money. We have a lovely new shopping mall — yet one out of three photocopiers in Steacie Library is working. Parking fees are outrageous — like parking in downtown Toronto. The fine for parking three feet on "hash-lines" is \$75.00! Financial Aid has great staff, but not nearly enough.

For my \$2800.00 this year, the service just isn't good enough.

And a final message to that man who refused to help me last night, what goes around comes around... So don't ever leave your lights on — you may be stranded because no one will help you.

From a frustrated Science student,
Susan Andrews.

P.S. Hey York, did you know that if a student gets nothing but headaches and a mediocre education, he or she might decide to send no alumni support after he or she leaves?

Who really killed JFK?

Dear Editor,

All shook up with emotions after seeing the motion picture "JFK", I have resumed interest concerning this "unsolved" crime. The appointed Warren commission concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald shot Kennedy, aiming from the 6th floor of a book depository building. It further said that he fired three bullets, two missed, and one hit Kennedy's head. This conclusion is outrageously ridiculous. First of all the doctors at Dallas Parkland Hospital, found two wounds, one in the throat, and one in the head. Oswald stood 180 degrees behind the President — what about the throat-wound? And the head wound appeared in the upper front-right section. Several witnesses could distinguish a man and a rifle behind a fence, which was just across the street, at the location where Kennedy was hit. It was probably not more than 20 metres away. Now, this would explain both wounds. But the man behind the fence is 29 years later, still a mystery. So, who pulled the trigger? Maybe it was a conspiracy, in order to overthrow Kennedy and his political concepts. The FBI chief in 1963 was J. Edgar Hoover and everybody knows about his long-standing disagreements and disputes with the "Kennedys". Perhaps, this feud should

be reassessed, in order to find out, who really pulled the trigger. I have a theory of my own. I believe that Hoover hired Oswald to appear as a scapegoat for the American public. Why? He was a convinced Marxist-Leninist! Now, how to master this plan? I think Hoover could not have done it more perfectly. Put Oswald up there, threaten him to shoot a few bullets at random. At the same time, a sharp-shooting FBI agent could hide in range behind that fence, and easily kill Kennedy at close range. From films, later revealed to the public, we can clearly see that Kennedy is struck in the upper-front section of the head. He falls backwards (as well as his brain tissue). Oswald, at that moment, stood about 100 metres behind the President's car. If Oswald did fire the fatal shot, it would have hit the back of Kennedy's head, and most importantly, Kennedy would have fallen forwards. He did not. Apparently, everytime one looks at this peculiar case, white is black and black is white!

Peter A. Vadera.

One ticket on Anal Airways



Dear Editor,

Re: "Smooth and Deadly", (*Excalibur*, Jan. 12/92)

I must say that you did a great job slamming Slik Toxik. However it seems that as you got carried away with your insults, you forgot your responsibility as a critic/journalist. When you are reviewing an album, one must, by law,

We will publish, space permitting, letters up to 250 words. They must be typed, double spaced, and accompanied by the writer's name and telephone number. Material deemed libelous or discriminatory by the staff of *Excalibur* will be rejected. The opinions expressed in this section are those of the letter-writers and do not represent those of the *Excalibur* staff, Editorial Board, or Board of Publications. *Excalibur* is not responsible for the factual accuracy of the letters published.

use "legitimate" references. And if you are to paraphrase, it must be licit use of the content. Isn't this common sense? And since this isn't to you, do the terms misleading, misrepresentation, slander, and libel mean anything? Regardless of how artistically snide or cutely sarcastic your attempt was, you are still "without" the authority to "purposely" misquote the source of which your article is based on. So for your information, the lead singers name is Nicolas Walsh and not Riff Raff, as your name is not *Excalibur*. And since the formation of Slik Toxik in 1988, they have been an "all original" act, and were signed to Capital Records as such. So *Excalibur*, bud, get with it! You obviously can't write, so at least pick up the bio again (you do know what that is don't you?) and learn to read it!

On behalf of the literate population, I believe that out of my professional/moral conduct and even good-taste, which you seem to know nothing about, a formal apology... no, better yet, a retraction is absolutely necessary. I think it's about time you re-read your slanderous and unfounded review and see what a self-humiliating boo-boo you have made. And also, please be advised that a one way ticket on Anal Airways, bomb included is in the mail with your name on it. It has been my pleasure.

Disgusted,
G. Kalik

York courses favour racism

Dear Editor,

While attending a class on Canadian foreign policy and defense policy on Feb. 27, several student presentations occurred whereby the merits and disadvantages of low level fighter pilot training over Inuit land was discussed. Having brought up the point that Inuit land in Labrador has never been extinguished and therefore the Canadian government had no right to sanction low-level fighter training, our class was then subjected to a barrage of anger by one presenter directed toward Indians in general, where I quote, "I am sick and tired of listening to 5,000 moronic and whining Indians complaining about land. Majority rules in this country. When Indians pay taxes then they have a right to decide policy agenda." In addition to this pointless tirade, a joke about alcoholism was overheard, as well as an advocacy of assimilation.

Although I welcome freedom of speech and rational academic discussion, what I will not sanction, nor tolerate is racism. This student's comments revealed an ignorance of societies that did not possess, nor want to adopt, the tenets of the value system of that of the dominant society in Canada — specifically White society. I cannot truly express my feelings of outrage and anger at the pugnacious and bigoted attitudes encountered at that class. If university students are to be the future leaders of this nation, then I truly lament for Canada's survival.

This incident has led me to question where does such ignorance xenophobia come from? If we are a product of that which history teaches us, is York University aiding this uninformed thought by having no Political Science or History courses dealing with the aboriginal experience in Canada. Considering the 200 years of squalid racism Canadian governments have pursued and in light of the profound aboriginal constitutional challenge today, is this lack of courses in itself not institutional racism?

Raymond Smith
Fourth Year Political Science