Gateway - Page 5

• We can also recommend that academic staff be disciplined under the discipline measures which exist in their agreement with the Board of governors, and that students be disciplined under the Code of Student behaviour.

•Mr. Walker suggests employees have no "meaningful protection" from reprisals for having been involved in a complaint. PACSH has just obtained a strengthened clause protecting those in a sexual harassment complaints from reprisal. This strengthened clause was not supported by NASA, the association Mr. Walker represents.

• Mr. Walker is aware of one side of the case in two complaints handled by PACSH two years ago. Because our hearings are confidential, he is not aware of the other side of these cases, or of other cases we have handled since then. His judgement as to our. effectiveness is based on limited information.

In conclusion, Mr. Walker's comments are illadvised. I ask that they not be allowed to prevent anyone from approaching PACSH with a problem. We have been helpful, and will continue to be helpful, to a wide variety of individuals, including members of the Non-academic Staff Association.

Leslie Bella, Chairman President's Advisor Committee on Sexual Harassment

Drop the defenses

I would like to urge the Christian community to accept some of Judith Haiven's allegations as honest criticism, as hard as that medicine may be to take.

I must admit that in purusing Haiven's book I can clearly see that she speaks as an outsider and does not exhibit a deep understanding of fundamentalism in that she does not see or attempt to explain WHY fundamentalists behave as they do. I think in this respect Templeton's forward shows deeper insight than the rest of the book. Nonetheless, I do believe the book touches on some key issues.

In particular I refer to the general lack of social concern and the closed mindedness evident in many evangelical Christians. I realise there exists notable exceptions with respect to social concern (such as YWAM, World Vision and Salvation Army), but for the most part many evangelical churches primary focus is preaching and building bigger buildings or expanding to TV or radio not feeding the hungry and helping the needy (as well as helping them spiritually).

In general it personally grieves me to see the isolaconist and close minded attitudes of must fundamentalists. What I see (as it seems Haiven does) is a real "hide your light under a bushel" mentality where one's fundamental focal point is church activity and defending Christianity against the "secular humanists". The only real contact with the rest of the community is at work or when evangelizing, rather than deep meaningful friendships in which the love of Christ is demonstrated.

It seems the fundamentalist community has a myopic, simplistic view of scripture where Christ merely "preached to the lost" and ignored physical needs. Even a superficial examination of the New Testament will reveal that Christ healed and met the peoples physical needs as he preached, the preaching and meeting of needs were inextricably intertwined.

It is time the Christian community began to show Christ by their lives. Instead of wringing your hands and crying about Morgentaler why don't you take measures to offer viable alternatives to abortion. I suggest opening houses for unwed mothers offering them professional counselling and a supportive environment to have their child. And if the mother so chooses, help her to find adoptive parents for her baby.

Many evangelicals that I know are very closed minded and suspicious of anything scientific or academic and exhibit this attitude openly. I even see this in some who are students. I am tired of hearing about the "secular humanist conspiracy" at the university In case you are wondering, no, I am not an unbeliever. I met Christ in 1973 and have also worked as a missionary for a well known organization. The Lord has made a profound difference in my life and I appreciate Him for it. But with much sadness I must say that Mrs. Haiven has spotted "the log in the eye" of the evangelical Christian community, don't be defensive, but listen to her with humility.

Ken Light Computing Science III

No respect for Gateway

This is what really happened at the Media Selection Committee on March 20, when we met to select the Editor-in-Chief for the 85/86 year. The committee was composed of 6 Gateway staff and 3 student councillors; the VP Internal was the chair.

As soon as we sat down, the "Gateway members" put forward a motion to disallow any or all questions that the majority of the committee did not want the only candidate (Suzette Chan) to answer. When the chair (myself) ruled the motion out of order as this was an interview, and if the candidate did not want to answer a question it was her choice to refuse to, the Gateway staff block voted and overturned the decision of the chair. After 40 minutes of discussion as to why the Gateway staff was refusing to allow any of the councillors to ask the applicant any questions, the Gateway staff put forward a motion to ratify Suzette Chan as Editor-in-Chief for the 85/86 term. At this point, one of the councillors resigned from the committee and left. When the Gateway staff found out that if we could not ask the applicant a question, this would not be an interview and the decision of the committee would not be legal, they withdrew their motion. After the applicant evaded two questions from a councillor, a motion was put forward to ratify Suzette Chan. The six Gateway staff voted in favor and the two councillors abstained.

When students ask me why I have no respect for Gilbert Bouchard, or some of the staff of the Gareway. I've always got an answer. What is also interesting is that Marie Clifford (Arts councillor 85/86) was one of the "Gateway members" involved in this farce. I wish the students the best of luck next year; they're going to need it.

> Gord Stamp VP Internal

Editor's note: Clifford does not become a Students' Councillor until May 1, 1985.

Avoiding stereotypes

I'm responding to an interview done by the Gateway with Author Judith Haiven.

Well-done Judith Haiven. The book Faith Hope and No Charity is well written and researched. As with any book of this type though, the groups behind some terminology can become as fixed as the terms.

Haiven's information and reporting on Jerry Falwell are timely. He is dangerous to Christianity as a whole and most certainly to American government policy. The problem seems to be with the terminology. It is unfortunate she did not use "fundamentalist" instead of born-again. Using this term, she equates a wide spectrum of Christianity with very narrow political views. She's right, there is a group in the U.S. and Canada who hold very right-wing pronuclear pro-Reagan, anti-third world views. Unfortunately, as a Christian, I understand that there is a large group of believers who are born-again into a personal relationship with Jesus Christ who: • Don't like Reagan

Believe in a nuclear disarmament

- Think the Americans should get out of Central America.
- See the evolutionary process as evidence of God's , and
- And contribute to organizations that provide food



"I'm losing my mind... over 200 entries to judge

