

Boys will be boys - yuck!

We would like to draw students' attention to an incident which occurred in RATT on Friday afternoon.

Several large tables, predominantly men, "rated" women as they walked past by clapping, cheering, standing ovations and other such activities. To call this activity distasteful and extremely distasteful is an understatement.

Having a few drinks with "the boys" is fine, having a few laughs is great; however, we found this particular activity to be insulting, intimidating (many women were afraid to even stand up) and the fun was at someone else's expense — namely women.

This kind of behaviour clearly indicates a serious lack of awareness about women and women's rights. We are not pieces of merchandise to be "rated". Even after some men were asked to stop, comments like "we're only having a bit of fun" and "the guys at the other table are doing it"

demonstrated the kind of purile mentality of some of the men on this campus.

RATT is a place where people can have a few drinks and a good time. We think that some may think twice about going there again on a Friday afternoon.

Play while you can!

Run and play football or walk on the Corbett Hall playing field now while it's still there! By 1983, there may be a rectangular fieldhouse about 600 feet by 400 feet, 60 feet high on that land, dwarfing Corbett Hall. It will seat 10,000 people, (about four times the number seated at the Jubilee Auditorium when it is full), and have room for the World Student Games as well.

Since the university is not subject to city zoning laws or building regulations, this huge edifice will be decided upon by the Board of Governors without any

Women should not have to be subjected to this kind of behavior — we are not second-class citizens or commodities — we are people and expect to be treated as such.

Rated and Unimpressed
Names withheld by request.

consultation with the people who live in surrounding neighborhoods whose sense of proportion and harmony of surroundings may be offended by the sight of a bigger-than-Kinsmen fieldhouse adjoining Corbett Hall.

Where will the cars for 10,000 people park? All through the neighborhoods? Is this a new kind of block-busting?

If the neighbors are not to be consulted, will students and faculty be asked for input?

Talk about unilateral.....

J. Evans
Library Science

Socialism is the real villain

Although *Aspidistra* is the column with the best writing style in the *Gateway*, its actual content is usually fairly wide of the mark. An illustration of this is contained in last Thursday's issue, where Alison Thomson refers to a "crisis of capitalism precipitated by the Tories," thus strongly implying that capitalism is mostly responsible for the ills plaguing Britain at this time.

Bunk.

If one looks closely at the main problems affecting Britain today, the following stand out starkly:

1) People have come to expect automatic wage increases with no commensurate increases in productivity.

2) The government is looked upon as a potential universal provider from a bottomless lucky dip.

3) As a recent correspondent to the *Sunday Times* pointed out, the taxation system is based on plunder.

4) Uncompetitive industries

are protected from the blasts of attack by more efficient ones by extensive featherbedding, usually with the connivance of over-mighty trade unions whose leaders make Ronald Reagan seem like one of the intellectual stars of *Mensa*.

The above list is by no means complete, but it does provide a representative example. The point is that none of these things can be blamed on capitalism. Capitalism never promised people that they could work ever-decreasing hours for ever-increasing wages, capitalism never promised that Nirvana would come when the most productive sectors of the economy had been taxed into the ground, capitalism never said that nationalization and massive government intervention would solve everything, but socialism did (and still does). Isn't it just a little bit unfair to blame capitalism for the failure of socialism?

I am running out of space at

Pardon my negligence

Ron Guetter's response (November 12) to my letter concerning religion, politics, etc., drew to my attention several good points which I had overlooked.

It was indeed negligent of me to avoid mention of the plentiful good work being done by missionaries and other Church officials in Latin America and other parts of the world. Indeed, of the many foreign interests in the Latin and South American countries, those representing the Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican and other churches are the only ones who are fighting for the freedom and equality of the oppressed peoples of these countries. (Although, let's not forget, those churches played a huge role in the initial subjugation of those people. It was not until 1958 that the Vatican recognized the natives of Guatemala as full human beings, and that measure was undertaken only under great pressure.)

It was also faulty of me to paint all Christians with the same brush, an error that I assure you was made through sloppy writing, and not through conviction.

And, though saying that Christianity "has been associated with the Spanish Inquisition" is like saying Richard Nixon has been associated with Watergate, Mr. Guetter's letter is otherwise a sound and logical response to my

attacks. I remain an atheist, firm in my belief that it's not coincidence that Christianity is the official religion primarily of the rich, white, Western countries, but I salute Ron Guetter and his cogent point of view.

Finally, I promise, guys, I won't write another letter on the subject. There's too much of that going on throughout these pages as it is.

Martin Lamble
Ag III

Four-letter word rag

I am dismayed and disgusted at the standard of journalism sometimes seen in our newspaper — as exemplified in *Gateway's* reporting of the MLA visit to campus recently. Is that the best that the student newspaper of one of the country's leading universities can do? Has the anonymous writer of the article — in particular the photo caption — nothing more intelligent to offer us than a sniggering use of personal insult? No analysis; no informed commentary? Only four-letter words?

Richard Feilden
Grad. Studies

Ronald Reagan not a threat to world peace

In response to Stephen Phillips' Reader Comment, I would like to present a dissenting view and at the same time reassure Mr. Phillips that things won't be so bad under Reagan as he believes.

Mr. Phillips believes that the new American administration will lead us into a new Cold War and a massive arms race. A brief look at history should eliminate that fear. Presidents in the past have behaved vastly different in office than one would have believed they would from listening to their campaign rhetoric. Take the first World War, when the re-elected President Wilson, an avowed neutralist, sent troops to Europe within seven months of his election.

Lyndon Johnson was elected because he was able to convince the electorate that Barry Goldwater would send troops to Vietnam, Cuba, and eastern Europe and push the button at the same time. Within a year of his election he had U.S. Marines storming the beaches of Da Nang contrary to his pre-election promises.

Richard Nixon, the second most rabid anti-communist after Barry Goldwater, took a trip to Peiping and kissed the trio of Chicoms who controlled China. He also brought about the lessening of tensions with the Soviet Union and kissed Leonid himself on the cheek.

So take Reagan's rhetoric with a block of salt. Also be mindful of the reduced powers of the office of the President. Watergate and the excesses of Viet Nam have taken their toll on the powers available to a President. The Imperial Presidency of LBJ and Richard Nixon has given way to the Peanut Presidency in

which the second most powerful man in the world, after Leonid of course, cannot get a legislative package through a Congress dominated by his own party without substantial changes being made to it. Also witness the inability of President Ford to get Congress to send \$40 million dollars of small arms to some revolutionaries in Angola while Russians are blatantly airlifting tanks and helicopters to their side in the same state.

Yes, Reagan will increase defense spending, not by Carter's 5% but by maybe 6%. A 60 billion dollar tax cut leaves little room for increased defense spending. Besides, the power of the purse belongs to Congress and they will have the final say.

On the issue of China, Reagan does not want to destroy relations with Peiping but is merely worried about the effect on U.S. allies of the sell-out of Taiwan, a loyal and longtime ally. I wonder what the Saudis think when they see the door slammed on Taiwan's face.

Reagan's rejection of Salt II was accompanied by a call for immediate negotiations of Salt III which would incur deep cuts in the inventories of strategic weapons on both sides.

And finally, do not be surprised to find the Soviets striving to maintain friendly relations with the new administration which presents a sane and constant foreign policy after the uneasy roller coaster ride with the peanut farmer who invented the doctrine of flip-flop and zig-zag. I'm sure Helmut Schmidt would agree with my last statement.

Glenn Martin
Commerce III

Scientists must be ethical

Over the past two years I have had opportunity to attend a number of seminars given by researchers in the life sciences. During that time I have been singularly impressed by the extent to which we have managed to divorce morality from science. This is certainly not a novel perception on my part. More than fifty years ago, Albert Schweitzer observed that "our age has discovered how to divorce knowledge from thought, with the result that we have, indeed, a science which is free, but hardly any science left which reflects."

I was particularly distressed recently in listening to an enthusiastic presentation of the possible application of immunobiological research to the development of an anti-pregnancy vaccine. It was not the nature of the research itself nor the end to which it was directed that disturbed me; rather, it was the complete lack of discussion as to the practical consequences of the availability of such a vaccine.

It is not my intention to single out researchers in this field, but merely to use this example, because of its obvious ethical

significance, to direct attention to a more widespread lack of moral responsibility which extends to all fields of science. Abundant evidence exists all around us as to the impact of scientific advancement on lifestyle, yet scientists have continually neglected to openly discuss the foreseeable consequences of their research.

Not only does this demonstrate irresponsibility, but it has inspired the non-scientific community to jump to its own fantastic conclusions. Further-

more, the refusal of scientists to speak to ethical issues arising from their research simply encourages the ignorant populace to take matters into its own hands — even to the point of legislating the direction which scientific investigations may take.

It's about time that scientists began to reflect on the ethical consequences of their research. We have been allowed to shirk moral responsibility for too long.

Ted Milner
Grad Studies

Living threatens health

A Warning to Nashila Mohamed:

"...a sparse dinner of crackers, raw vegetables, cheese and fresh juice listed as safe foods by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare...." (No escaping Life's Risks - *Gateway*, November 20.)

"Crackers" forsooth! Do you think they are safe? Have you looked at the label of late? "B.H.A., B.H.T." — preservatives both, As well as some monoglyc' citrate!

You dare to eat vege'bles out of the ground, Sprayed weekly to kill all the bugs, Soaked to the marrow with chemicals raw, Fertilized, you might say, just with drugs?

When you squeeze your "fresh" juice you never will know, What absorptives a chemist would find — I'll wager you never take care not to drip In the poisonous spray off the rind!

And the cheese you would dare to ingest unaware — Have you looked at the color of cheddar? A vege'ble dye the gourmet to impress, But nothing could be only deader — or deader!

Observe all these perils, and strictly pay heed, Unless you would be a dead hero; So keep far away from all kinds of food And cut down your diet to zero.

G.N. Cormack, M.D.

STAFF
MEETING

Thursday,
4:00 p.m.

The Gateway
Room 282 SUB