

Continued from page 6

ship — it is a social one. For their husbands, however, fatherhood seems to require a genetic connection. Perhaps we need a "cultural shift" away from the sanctity of biological fatherhood.

And while we're at it, how about a move away from the sanctity of The Contract? Yes, Mary Beth Whitehead (mother of Baby M) signed a contract. What I agonize over is a society in which contracts are valued so much more highly than people. That's what is most frightening about these technologies — they exploit economic and social pressures to reduce women to body parts, to reproductive functions, to "contractors".

Drew says cultural changes would be more appropriate than a "blanket decision of the fertile majority on what should and should not be allowed". However, the cultural changes she suggests do not go far enough. We need a society in which women's choices to have or not have children are unrestricted and unconstrained by social and economic pressures. The technologies themselves are not inherently evil (except inasmuch as they rely upon the experimentation on, and abuse

of, women's bodies . . .). It is the control and use of them in our society that is most problematic.

The arguments used in support of reproductive technology are part of what Janice Raymond has called "procreative liberalism". They assume an equality of power, an equality of access to so-called rights and freedoms, which we don't in fact all have. Where power differences exist there is likely to be coercion, subtle or otherwise. The point of the impossibility of adoption for many infertile couples is a good one. However, Drew fails to point out that the women least likely to be able to adopt — non-white, single, lesbian, poor women — are also those least likely to be able to gain access to IVF.

Restricting the discussion of reproductive technologies to the level of the individual is dangerous. They affect all of us. All women will be affected by the way RTs are redefining motherhood; by the reinforcement of the idea that women are "naturally" mothers; by the reduction of women to interchangeable reproductive parts. We must weigh the possible benefits to a few women against the probable harm to women as a whole.

Brenda Beagan

Clark defendable?

To the Editors,

Your editorial 'Let them eat cake' (Dalhousie Gazette Dec 3/87) sure takes the cake!

While few would disagree that Dalhousie's Physical Plant is in serious need of a financial transfusion, much of the editorial comment was incorrect and misleading. Rather than dwell on the many inaccuracies, however, I would just like to take issue with the statements regarding President Clark.

As Director of Physical Plant and Planning at Dalhousie for the past twelve years, I have found the President not only very concerned about the state of the Physical Plant, but most supportive of the initiatives we have undertaken in response to the serious problems facing the University. I believe he has, on a number of occasions, brought to the attention of MPHEC the desperate need for an infusion of funds in order to repair the ravages of time and neglect. In this regard, it is interesting to note Mr. Stone's breathtaking self-contradiction in the space of one paragraph. Immediately after his statement that "the administration does not even try to work on the fundamental problem", he

criticizes the President for doing just that. It is, in fact, an increase in MPHEC funding which is required to help us address those fundamental problems!

May I suggest that, while it would probably not have been so much fun to write, a more factual and thoughtful analysis of the difficulties facing Dalhousie would have better served your readers.

**W.H. Lord
Director, Physical Plant
& Planning**

Ch-changes

To the Editors,

Once again, it seems, congratulations are in order for Dalhousie University. Although the Life Sciences Centre still retains the title of Ugliest Building Ever, the new addition to the Chemistry Building is the clear winner for Ugliest Building of the Decade.

The plain, textureless concrete walls are a shade of grey so distressingly uninteresting that one suspects a communist plot (perhaps to depress and demoralize us into submission?). The building's main feature is a gigantic, colourless Rubik's Cube, complete with L.S.C.-style

pollution vents. (Rubik's creation, of course, has a big advantage: When you get bored with it, you can hide it in the closet next to your copy of Saturday Night Fever.)

The slanted windows are a nice touch, and fluorescent lights will provide lots of photons for the lab rooms. But in some areas, the only source of light will be those annoying black cylindrical beasts that shine straight down only. These lights are familiar to any L.S.C. user who has faced the challenge of taking notes on a page obscured by the shadow of one's writing hand. Until the situation is corrected, there's money to be made selling battery-operated reading lamps (maybe like miner's helmets!) in the L.S.C. at exam time.

It would be difficult, admittedly, to design the building so as not to block the view of (and from) the respectable old Chemistry Building. And we will gradually accept the loss of those 30 or so parking spaces. But is it really necessary to deploy those missiles on the roof?

One can hardly attribute any oversights to speed, since construction is taking place at a rate that can only be expressed with reference to a geological time

Continued to page 8

UP HERE



STEP UP TO A BAR THAT'S DIFFERENT

1662 BARRINGTON STREET, 422-6775

ACROSS FROM KELLYS STEREO STORE

**"Downstairs
haven for the
young and the
restless —
definitely a
tavern with a
difference."**

**SEA
HORSE
TAVERN**