

Dialogue continued concerning Ka-Ching

To Paul White (again):

I enjoyed your rebuttal letter and comic strip in last week's Bruns. I enjoyed it because it was both revealing and controversial. I think this particular controversy is beneficial because many people are talking about an important issue that is too often ignored or is considered unimportant. The same thing happened last week during the

Conference on Women's Issues. The public exposure of the E.U.S. Handbook generated a lot of animated discussions ranging from issues concerning pornography, wife battering and day care. These discussions challenged a lot of concepts that are too often accepted automatically by society.

What I found revealing about your rebuttal were your reasons for being a "sexist

jerk" as you called yourself. You said you wanted any kind of response to your "contributions" to the Bruns, so you set out to be as offensive as possible. Why do you need to offend people? It doesn't seem to be much of an explanation for your comic strip.

Your other reason for being a "sexist jerk", as you called yourself, was that portraying women as "air-headed objects with bib boobs" is totally ac-

ceptable when it is in a comic strip form. What if you portrayed blacks in a similarly degrading manner in your comic strip? Do you think you could get away with it? I think a lot of people would get upset, and they wouldn't care if you had "never claimed that it is true to life" or not.

In your rebuttal, you revealed yourself to be incapable of responding to women in anything other than sexual and threatening terms. First, you threatened me with a libel suit because I had dared to criticize your (self admitted) sexist portrayal of women.

You said that I was lucky that you were "such a nice guy" or you'd sue me. That's a pretty threatening statement for someone who wasn't upset by a comic sketch. I wonder what you'll threaten me with next week? Secondly, you implicate me in your sexual fantasies, and in effect dismissed by criticism by inferring that I only did it to get your attention. You ignored any intellectual or social basis for my criticisms, and you failed to defend yourself in any intellectual capacity. You only made a bigger ass of yourself than you already seemed to be.

Another relation in your letter was that you didn't like being represented as a two dimensional, inaccurate stick figure. I am sorry if I offended you by that depiction of your

existence, but that is how you portray women every week; you couldn't take it when it was your image being distorted. No woman is "an airheaded object with big boobs," and most women understandably objected to being portrayed that way. You spent a lot of time correcting the physical and personal inaccuracies I had made in my drawing of you. I hope you have the intelligence to see how perfectly you demonstrated the similar need of women to be seen not just as sexual stereotypes.

One aspect of your letter I would like to correct is that I somehow maligned men in general. I implicated you personally and no one else.

I would like to end this letter by stating that the only thing I expected to provoke was some kind of discussion about sexism and stereotypes. I have been successful, and would like to thank you for your contributions in this matter. I don't expect you to change in any way, in fact, I expect Captain Ka-Ching to get worse but it was a chance I had to take in order to make some people aware of this and other related issues.

Your friend,

Kathleen Murphy

Lethbridge gets dumped

TO TIMOTHY LETHBRIDGE:

Do you own a dictionary? If so, did you look up the word counter and then sexism? According to my dictionary, counter means to oppose. Sexism means prejudice or discrimination against women.

I admit it, I oppose sexism, I am a counter sexist!

I also oppose racism, religious persecution, wife and child abuse, dictatorship, torture, nuclear war, and many other similarly

disgusting things. I would like to know what forms of racism or persecution you find "only mildly distasteful", and then let everyone know what would be acceptable. There are probably some racists out there who would like to come out of the closet and have their own comic strip.

I would also know to know how my sketch of Paul White evolved into what you called "anti-male sexism"? I criticized Paul White and Paul White only. I in no way applied that criticism to all men.

What does "anti-male sexism" mean anyway? According to my dictionary anti means to oppose. Male sexism means prejudice or discrimination against men.

I admit to being an anti-male sexist too! I suggest you purchase a dictionary and read it before you write any more editorials.

SHAME ON NAUGHTY EDITORS WHO DON'T READ THEIR DICTIONARY!

Kathleen Murphy

Cartoons should be an asset

To the Editor:

This letter is being written to comment on the comics in the Brunswickan. I do not wish to participate in type of letters that have been appearing in the Brunswickan for the past two weeks on this subject. Instead, I hope to offer some comments which of course, can be put into practice or disregarded.

My idea of a comic strip is to provide an opinion, viewpoint, thought or to be humorous. Many times they can be both seen in many examples ranging from "The Outcasts" to "Stanley and Harriet". I do not see either in the comics strips of the Brunswickan. I know this does not have to be since there is definite talent there.

I realize how much work goes into producing a comic strip since I have worked on two papers in five years. It is hard enough to come up with an idea and equally hard and in my case harder to put it on paper. The cartoonist of the Brunswickan has talent and I do respect that. I do not see, however, a lot of thought going into some ideas or do I see that the comics are funny.

I could very well have a view which is in the minority. If it is, then of course the majority

rules. I wonder, however, how many people actually read the comic strip and either

laugh or pause and think about the view expressed by the cartoonist.

The cartoons could be an asset to the paper, which ar-

tistically they are now but they could also, more importantly, provide humour or thought on a specific topic.

Yours sincerely,

Joy Faulkner
BA III

Paul White: warning

Editor:

Master White has obviously taken much delight in showing us the seat of his learning. One assumes he did not turn around so we would not see

how little knowledge he really has.

Fantasize about me, Paulie Boy, at your own risk.

Stephanie Towers.



Reader opposes double standard

To the editor:

While reading Paul White's response to Kathleen Murphy's cartoon of him, I could empathize with Paul's emotional, almost hysterical, reaction. I felt the same way when I read Captain Ka-Ching a couple of weeks ago.

What I fail to understand is Paul's double standard. Captain Ka-Ching is considered funny by Paul, while Kathleen's cartoon is offensive to him. It is again obvious that men have the freedom to depict women in a degrading manner, whereas women do not have the freedom to degrade men in a sexist cartoon.

Sexism is not a trivial matter, but a very serious one. It is part of the mechanism in society that has abused, degraded and hurt women for centuries. Paul hides his sexism behind the excuse "It's a comic strip, for God's sake".

Humour is not humour when great numbers of people, in this case women, are offended. Paul White is the creator of a sexist cartoon and therefore he is fully responsible for perpetuating the sexist beliefs of which women have been victims through abuse, violence and rape.

To ridicule Kathleen and threaten her with authority shows clearly how much Paul was hurt to seem himself objectified, ridiculed and degraded. Maybe Paul does understand the full meaning of sexism a little better now.

Hopefully, The Brunswickan will not close the debate on sexism. The matter is too serious to be put aside. A student newspaper is an excellent medium to discuss serious matters such as sexism which affect about half of UNB's student population.

Baukje (Bo) Miedema