

# Loosening morals has created problems

Dear Editor:

I am writing this letter in reference to the February 3 issue of the Brunswickan. It was in that issue that the column: The Armchair Quarterback featured "Ten Reasons Why Monday Night Football is Better Than Sex".

I feel there is another side of this issue that needs to be cleared up. I don't think that human sexuality should be degraded to such a level as it was in that article, even if it was all in fun.

It is unfortunate that our society has gotten to the point where this is perfectly acceptable to a large number of people. Of course, many will say that what is right or wrong is not possible to define and that it depends on each individual.

However, I'm afraid that there are some potential problems with that philosophy. Now don't get me wrong, I do not mean to put down anyone who found the article amusing, I only

wish to discuss this "right or wrong" issue.

Our western society is moving very capably to the view that there are no real moral absolutes. Each person's conscience will dictate his or her behavior, and as long as no one gets hurt, everything is fine. This sounds acceptable on paper but there are some glaring flaws when it is put into practice.

One problem I see is simply this: where will it lead us? In our mass media age we are constantly being bombarded by huge amounts of information everyday; and whether we care to admit it or not, our opinions are to some extent formed by what we see and hear. What I see is a media which is very frequently presenting to us a lifestyle of no concrete moral absolute. Look at how our culture has changed since the advent of television. While the media is a reflection of our culture, its ef-

fects on it are hard to overlook. In light of this, our conscience cannot always be trusted as our moral guide because it subject to change (for better or worse). If the present drift in our society keeps up, where will our attitudes toward sexuality be in another fifty years? I'm afraid articles like "Ten Reasons Why Monday Night Football is Better Than Sex" are a disturbing commentary on our present attitudes.

However, it may please others that sex is openly discussed in our culture (and sometimes rather flip-pantly). We have been told that we must "ventilate" this issue, and get all out in the open. Our society has done that. All we hear about now is sex. It is used

to sell products, to increase television show ratings, to get a few laughs, and a myriad of other things. Perhaps we have gone too far. I'm not saying that if a husband and wife have a child that they should "hush up" on the "facts of life". However, the whole issue of human sexuality should be treated with a certain amount of respect. We throw the word "sex" around with no respect for its full meaning. In many cases sex is no longer an expression for love but rather a self gratification. Our society has even gone so far as to centre "true love" around the sexual experience, thus basing love on a feeling. When the feeling is gone, the love is gone. This could be the source of a lot of marriage

breakdown.

Society has sex very much in the open, so why aren't the problems associated with the so called "hush-hush" attitude going away? As we continue to let our society's moral standards slip, is it any coincidence that rapes and other sex-related crimes are increasing? No, we haven't solved any problems by "loosening up" our standards, but we've managed to create quite a few in the process.

I'm not blaming the Armchair Quarterback for all the problems of our society, but things like "Ten Reasons Why Monday Night Football is Better Than Sex" certainly don't help the situation.

Yours very sincerely,

Darren McHarg

## A new socioeconomic term

Dear Editor:

The intent of this article is to introduce a new term into the lexicography of socio-economics.

The term is "nouveau poor" by which is meant a person of middle class origins who finds himself in a situation of poverty -that is, the person no longer has the resources to obtain the types of food or to participate in the activities or to have the living conditions which are widely approved in our society.

What differentiates the "nouveau poor" from the established poor is that, while the latter make claim to their status through living in a poverty situation of long-standing, the former acquire of their status through a change from a comfortable economic position to a sudden discovery of new-found poverty.

The "nouveau poor" persons retains the values of the middle class whence he comes; he has not yet accepted his new status as his due in the manner of the

"noble" poor. The New Poor, is, for example, a white collar worker or a blue collar worker, who having lived a life of relative comfort, now finds himself out of work with no further opportunities of employment. He tends to feel that the condition under which he now lives is only a temporary one; that a better life lies just around the corner.

The noble poor look upon such newcomers as upstarts who are not well-versed in the culture of poverty: the noble poor see their position as one that "will always be". They have blood lines that run back through generations of poverty; they realize that history has meant them to have this station in life.

A person of the "nouveau poor", on the other hand, lives on the borderline of two cultures: he is poor; yet he still believes in a system that teaches that ability determines one's position in society.

Larry Fyffe

## Bridge demolition abuse of liberty

Dear Editor:

Will the demolition of a useful bridge - for apparently little reason - be another example of ineptitude, or of corruption? Besides the Trans-Canada bridge on the eastern side of Fredericton, there is one which makes a more convenient connection from the downtown area to the growing district across the river. Why should its citizens wish to do away with this? Many cities worldwide each have dozens of bridges over their many waterways. A percentage of these in Europe and Asia are ancient structures. Urban planners in our "new world" seem to have a compulsion to do away with things a bit old.

Present governments borrow money as economies progress into debt. If this is necessary for needed operations or worthwhile projects, then there is less disagreement, but why pay for such things as tearing a bridge apart? Is it an obstruction? Are there sound reasons for doing this?

Since it has stood for many years, it must have been built strong and durable. If they figure it becoming weak for heavy

vehicles, why not retain its use for cars? If the fairly large amount of \$500,000.00 (at least by ordinary taxpayers' standards) is available to pay a demolition company then why wouldn't it be more logical to strengthen this bridge instead? Some technicians should surely be able to figure out ways to have work done on it and to keep the costs within reasonable sums. The alternative will see train car loads of its steel sold for scrap. This will benefit only those few involved with additional profits. Is this good management when tax money greatly aids a local steel mill to keep running? Powerful people too often abuse those liberties given them by voters and consumers.

Dan Lloyd  
Brooklyn, Queens Co.  
Nova Scotia

P.S.:

Tonight (Feb. 7, 1984) on ASN -T.V. news they reported that the walkways of the bridge are being removed. Those struggling to save the structure have just received a cost estimate of renewing needed materials from an engineering firm for a price of \$4,500.00. It is no wonder

expenses are so high when consultants charge exorbitant fees!

As students you know how long you can live on \$4,500.00. A qualified carpenter earning union wages of about \$12.50 an hour would have to work nearly 3 months to make this much, considering income tax deductions. Non-union tradesmen in rural areas usually earn much less. A labourer making \$5.00 an hour would spend 5 1/2 months for the same amount. How long would it take you to earn this much if you were "experienced", skilled or even had a degree? How many days did an engineer or two take to calculate this estimate? The projected repair cost is around \$1 million. Many volunteers still work for no money at all.

## Says it all

Dear Editor:

RE: John Geary's Response to Ladies of McLeod.

The fact that you must spend so much time defending your article so vehemently says it all.

A lady of McLeod