

# EDITORIAL

## Get Together

I have come to the conclusion that social concerns are subject to a kind of societal attention span. That they rise and fall in popularity much in the way of musical trends.

Concerns about racial prejudice, the promise of socialism, and the environment are fading while interests today reach an emotional fever pitch in other areas. The problem with this kind of intense emotionalism is that it often makes an objective look at these concerns extremely difficult.

Let me consider the women's movement and some recent news developments to illustrate.

The agenda for WRCUP's (that's w for western, not for women) Victoria conference proposed the establishment of a Women's Rights Coordinator. What bothered me about this proposal was CUP (Canadian University Press) already had a Human Rights Coordinator—and that coordinator was and is a woman. I found myself reacting emotionally to the implicit suggestion that a Human Rights Coordinator was somehow unable to oversee women's rights as well.

I recently read a piece on Judy Chicago's *Dinner Party* which outlined the considerable problems encountered in staging the work's tour. To my embarrassment, as a male, I found that in virtually all cases the funds needed to mount the show came from women.

Were there no men who appreciated the work enough to contribute or were they never given the opportunity?

I'm travelling to Calgary this weekend to see the show, hoping I can gain some unbiased enjoyment from the work of art. A celebration of the contributions women have made in history is a great idea but from what I can gather it also points out what assholes men historically have been. Adding to my unease will be the presence of my mother and another close female friend.

Maybe a eunuch or a hermaphrodite can understand my mixed emotions.

Consider the recent involvement of the women's wing of the NDP in the debate over prostitution. According to the brief account I got their proposal is that women prostitutes are 'slaves' and that the appointment of women to 're-educate' these unfortunates will lead to the solution of the problem.

Is prostitution solely a problem of women's misunderstanding?

Another story was about the woman bandit in India who became a folk hero for her numerous murders, seductions and robberies. Reports on her life seemed to suggest it was her husband, who threw her out of the home soon after their marriage; and her subsequent brutalization at the hands of men that led her to a life of crime.

Would a man under similar circumstances be so understandingly spoken of? And would either sex deserve such understanding?

I guess what I'm really trying to say here is that the intense, emotionalism felt over the issue of women's equality is leading to conclusions that are rather nonsensical and sometimes counter-productive to a goal which is vitally important—to women and men.

What I think is needed is a more charitable approach to the problem from both sides of the sexual fence.

Men should get off their chauvinistic high horses and admit that women have been getting the short end of the stick. They should realize women have been treated as lesser human beings and sexual objects long enough. They should actively defend women's rights as they would their own.

What I hope women can do, as they rise in their righteous indignation is avoid making two mistakes that will damage what they are hoping to do. The first mistake would be to become negative towards men rather than a system which encourages male preference. Don't hate us, help us understand and participate. Second I would hope they would not make the tragic mistake of turning injustice full circle. In other words please don't take all we've done wrong to you and do it to us. For example I would hope a women's advocate would see the objectification of male sexuality as being inherently degrading as their own.

I would conclude by saying that in my opinion inherent differences between women and men exist that go beyond physiology. My contention is that these differences need not be a source of conflict, but rather can prove a means for mutual growth and development for the two that would otherwise be impossible.

Vive la difference.

Jim Miller

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - Andrew Watts  
 NEWS EDITORS - Allison Annesley, Richard Watts  
 MANAGING EDITOR - Jens Andersen  
 ARTS EDITOR - David Cox  
 SPORTS EDITOR - Brent Jang  
 PHOTO EDITOR - Ray Giguere  
 CUP EDITOR - Wes Oginski  
 PRODUCTION - Anne Stephen, Jim Miller  
 ADVERTISING - Tom Wright  
 MEDIA SUPERVISOR - Margriet Tilroe-West  
 CIRCULATION - Gunnar Blodgett

**Staff this issue:**

Aspiring writers and future Page 8 editors Gilbert Bouchard, John Algard and Martin Coutts are off to judge the Miss Nude Campus contest. John Roggeveen is taking fencing lessons, while Bruce Pollock composes ditties to amuse Ken Lenz and Tanya Morrison. Zane Harker, Michael Skeel, and Mary Anne Nielsen tease Teri Lyn Paulgard about her dress; Sarah Hickson and Nate LaRoi dance to 'Roc about the Troc.' Lois Dayes is herself, which is sufficient. Jack Vernee and Bill Inglee discuss the colour yellow with Martin Beales and Dave Grandy. Jim Gerwing wrestles with writer's block. Dale Lakevold has a cup and watches the staff play copy, copy, who's got the copy?

The Gateway is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. Contents are the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief; opinions and editorials are signed by the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. Newsroom: Rm 282, Advertising Dept.: Rm 256D, Students' Union Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2J7. Newsroom phone 432-5168 (5178), Advertising - 432-4241, Ext. 28. The Gateway is a member of Canadian University Press. Newspaper readership is 25,000.

**gateway**  
 VOL. LXXIII NO. 40



## « LETTERS TO THE EDITOR »

### Gateway should promote peace and prosperity

P = Shauna Peets.

I find the article published under the caption "Second Wind" by P in the 8th February issue of Gateway is less meaningful (sic) and quite unacceptable for the following reasons:

1. It is less meaningful because P discusses about some material which we have never been given a chance (according to P's article) to read.

2. For the following reasons the article is quite unacceptable:

(a) first and foremost, a newspaper being (sic) a public service, must help promote peace and prosperity of the people. This is especially so, with respect to articles written by staffers. On the contrary P's article widens the misunderstanding already existing between the west and the eastern bloc. But I think, this very misunderstanding is the main cause (I think the mistrust and fear of each other stems from misunderstanding) of uncontrolled arms race which threatens the future world peace. And squeezed (sic) between the arms race (indirectly) are the world's poorest people experiencing a continual (pre war?) death (hunger and disease). In that sense P's article neither promotes peace nor promotes prosperity of the people.

(b) to me, a journalist has to be open-minded and unbiased. An outright censor (past, present and future) of one side of the story, as implied in the first and the last paragraphs of the article can not be considered to be either unbiased or open-minded on logical reasoning. (BBC's efforts (must be commended) to be unbiased (on one of the most delicate issues) during Falkland's war could be a good example for P to remind, what unbiased and open-minded journalism is).

(c) the words and phrases "crap", "the ignorance of the Soviet public" in P's article are too conclusive to be coming from a Gateway journalist (without giving valid reasons).

(d) A part of the press freedom to me, is the reader's right to decide which is "crap" and which is not. To make that decision for the reader by a journalist certainly amounts to an underestimation of reader's intelligence. And moreover P's kind of journalism ensures press freedom only to those who control it.

Finally it must be emphasized, that the issue here is not the fact that the news coming from Soviet embassy is not published in Gateway. Even if you had published, no one would have believed the Soviet version to be the absolute truth. The main issue is P's article only. In order words, the main issue is the general philosophy of Gateway journalism by P, reflected in her article.

P.S. P, what do you think about, the US government naming three Canadian documentaries political propaganda? (My view is as exactly stated above; give people a chance to decide, everybody is intelligent enough to do that).

L. Samarasekera, Graduate Studies

### Poor, bigoted, uncritical, pseudo-intellectual Jens

The anti-Catholic bigotry evidenced in Jens Andersen's March 1, 1983 "Chopping Block" is opprobrious and unworthy of the Gateway. May I point out that a quarter of the student population is Catholic? Because most of the professors were hired prior to the Human Rights legislation only about 7 per cent of the academic staff admits to being Catholic.

The poor pseudo-intellectual, Jens, uncritically mouths the sectarian polemic leveled against the Church. Is the two thousand year old institution, statistically the largest in the world, free of sin? No! Furthermore, when looking at its leadership, it could only have survived these many years because of God.

For more than a thousand years the Church was

responsible for education and the social services; nearly all European universities have ecclesial (sic) origins. The humanist, Erasmus, claimed that wherever Protestant sectarianism prevailed, education suffered. If you are going to trot out Galileo, or the Spanish Inquisition, I'll counter with Luther's endorsement of the killing of over 100,000 peasants in order to impose Protestantism on Germany (Jeden, V:235). This type of polemic serves no useful purpose.

You are partially right in one thing, Jens. Both the Hebrew and the Christian Scriptures are socialist in intent. Marx, like his Jewish forefathers, was also a socialist. He co-opted no one. When John Paul II wrote on the nature of work, he was in the footsteps of a venerable humanist/socialist tradition. Theologians had been saying it for years. The Canadian bishops' document to which you refer carries on the ancient tradition.

There is one thing in your favour, Jens; anti-Catholicism is the anti-semitism of the intelligentsia. Don't let knowledge obfuscate opinions.

U. Deis

### Act NOW! for PEACE!

In the near future, Edmonton's City Council will debate the proposal by Edmonton's five nuclear disarmament groups which reads as follows: "Do you support balanced nuclear disarmament beginning with a verifiable USA-USSR freeze on the testing, production and deployment of all nuclear weapons and their delivery systems?"

We would first like to say that we, like virtually every Canadian, support peace and worldwide disarmament. After all, who doesn't? However, let's analyse the proposed disarmament question.

Insofar as Canada is concerned, even the Cruise missile tests would be consistent with Canada's non-nuclear policy which prohibits the testing of nuclear material on Canadian soil.

The question asks if we support a USA-USSR reduction in arms. Frankly, we have some serious doubts if the United States or the Soviet Union will reduce their nuclear arsenal because Edmontonians voted for it. This question would appear to be far beyond the jurisdiction of Edmonton's City Council.

Furthermore, we also question whether the peace movement will be successful in reducing SOVIET nuclear weapons, not strictly NATO's weapons. If you recall, last year during the UN disarmament week, hundreds of thousands of people marched for peace and disarmament around the world. Even in Moscow, an independent peace group marched for peace. However, unlike peace marchers in the West, CKXM news reported that Soviet peace marchers were "detained". If you have ever talked with, or read about people from East block (sic) countries, you will soon learn that "detention" usually means either internment in psychiatric institutions, years of slave labor in Siberia, or even death! (Read about Soviet defectors Alexander Solzhenitsyn or Simas Kudirka). How can the Soviet communists harass Russian peace marchers not sponsored by the government, while at the same time verbally support and help finance Western peace movements (see *The Journal*, Nov. 22/82, p.A5; *Reader's Digest*, Nov./82). Let us reiterate: Considering the harsh treatment from communist authorities of the independent Soviet peace movements, we're hardly convinced that the USSR will voluntarily disarm because Edmonton's peace movements wish to vote for disarmament.

The disarmament question proposed calls for a verifiable freeze and reduction of nuclear armaments. We, like most Canadians, would love nothing better than to see a VERIFIABLE freeze and subsequent reduction of nuclear weapons! However, here again, this question's purpose may be deceiving. Consider the following passage from the essay "Deterrence Vs. The Freeze" in last November's issue of *Reader's Digest*:

As an expression of general concern, the halt-in-place freeze is laudable. But as a practical purpose, it is a disaster. First, it is unverifiable: the production of