



## editorial

# It's the principle of the thing

### Literary prophylactic

Will the cultured aristocrat who has managed to destroy the myth that U of A students are liberal thinkers (or thinkers at all) please step forward from among his blond, blue-eyed anonymous friends under whose camouflage he's been hiding and take his place on the dias of distinguished locals, so that the rest of us can leer at you?

I speak, of course, of the literary prophylactic A. Bunker (for lack of a better name), who has managed to scribble in childish grandeur "down with gooks" and other such memorabilia on the washroom walls in SUB.

Such insight!

Such depth!

Such affirmation of white supremacy!

Go to it Bunker! Let us all see your true colors! Why hide yourself? We all would like to know and talk with a man who can appeal to such a great majority of people. After all, "fuck off gooks" epitomises so efficiently the mentality of the majority here.

This man is a danger, but a danger to whom?

Well, aside from being a source of irritation to the janitorial staff who have to scrape it off the walls, it is a source of disgust for anyone who likes to think his fellow students are intelligent.

You, Bunker, are definitely not.

You, Bunker, are a hunk of shit.

Fellow students, watch out for this guy. He can be described as white, caucasian, university age, but not of university intelligence. He is dangerously armed with a red felt pen.

He is lurking among you.

Greg Neiman

### Sex attraction

I would like to emphasize a point which I take for granted as being quite ordinary, but have recently come to the conclusion that it is one of which many people are still unaware. This point is that people can actually be very comfortable and attracted to members of the opposite sex without being sexually attracted to them. They like spending time doing things for and with each other, like "dropping in for tea and a chat," and are genuinely interested in the ups and downs in the other's life. They enjoy attending sports and social events and having meals together, and become close friends, yet still have no desire to sleep with each other. And furthermore, they continue to be good friends even after one or both find mates, this occurring without jealousy or resentment.

The kind of relationship I've just described does happen and people who haven't experienced it are missing something pretty wonderful. If it is offered to you, be receptive; relax and accept it without suspicion and without demanding more. You'll soon realize that you're sharing something special and - that's alright!

L.K. Petro

### Bus rider

This letter is in response to one Mrs. I. MacDonnell, who complains that young University students do not offer seats to older women and men in crowded busses. Ah! Her letter is signed off with a "Mrs." before her name, and presumably she is/was married and has young and old offsprings in her family.

If Mrs. MacDonnell demands that any student offer her a seat in a crowded bus during peak hours, then, why, OH WHY, did she bear children of her own

The academic community has long been a bastion in the defence of the right of free speech, the dictum that any individual may expound his views in any public forum available to him by *right*, not by the *license* or *permission* or any King, Bureaucrat, or Prime Minister such exposition of ideas being subject only to the censure and control of the speaker's own taste and the laws concerning defamation.

This is a natural enough stance in a community where the free and unfettered expression of ideas is the precious coin of the realm. Occasionally, in this defence, the academic community has had to adopt an awkward and uneasy posture sometimes an even embarrassing one. Thus, defenders of free speech find themselves, as in Berkeley during the '60's, supporting even actively fighting for such inanities as the right to say four letter words in public! More recently, the *cause celebre* of free speech advocates has been the on-screen antics of one Linda Lovelace.

I don't for one second believe that the advocates of free speech find anything of value in these enterprises worth supporting in and of itself. Rather, it is the symbolism involved. Indeed, Mr. Damiano (I can't remember his first name), the producer of the Linda Lovelace adventure series, while being pressed for justification of pornography on the *Under Attack* program some weeks ago, refused outright to offer any justification of pornography, *per se*, on anything other than the symbolic level.

Damiano candidly admitted that he, himself, thought that what he put on the screen was disgusting in and of itself. Yet, he felt almost compelled to produce such spectacles in order to push the system and test its limits. He appears to believe that, unless one can say, or, in his case, show absolutely anything in the media without

who will then by Malthusian geometric progression reproduce themselves and cause a crowded society which may share common bonds of kinship but always living in alienation scrambling for possession and plunder for self-gratification?

My suggestion to this Mrs. MacDonnell, is that she may just refrain herself from making complaints regarding young men like ourselves, and if she could live the life without having children - oh, glory be, how vast the country and how plentiful the seats would be just waiting to be warmed up by her ample bottom!

From a colored student of U of A and a daily commuter in the Big Red Mammoth called ETS.

### READER COMMENT

fear of legal censure, than one is not truly free and one does not truly have the right of free speech. If there is some point beyond which one cannot go without the government stepping in and saying, "Hold it boys, that's a little more than we will tolerate", then you must realize that everything else you may say up to that point of resistance is equally tolerated. If indeed there is such a point then free speech is a chimera; it is not free speech, it is tolerated speech; it is not the advocacy of views by *right*, but rather by *permission*.

Whether one accepts Damiano's justification of what he does at face value or not is of no consequence; it is true that what is important about being able to produce and show a *Deep Throat* is the the symbolism involved in the act, the *de facto* assurance that there is no such point of resistance, that there are no such limits.

So it is with gun-control legislation.

Senate Bill S-14 proposes to confiscate hand-guns and prohibit the private ownership of such artifacts in Canada. Ostensively, the Bill is being pushed as a crime-control measure but the rather enuous and dubious link between gun-ownership and crime gives one cause to wonder. Even if such a link could be unequivocally established the Bill should be opposed on symbolic grounds.

The dividing line between democracy and tyranny is, of certainty, a narrow one. Freedom is an incredibly fragile construct; IT IS SO INTERTWINED WITH TRADITION AND THIS SYMBOLISM I've been talking about that I am constantly surprised that it has any staying power, whatsoever.

### Oversight

I am disappointed in a recent oversight of your sports editor. Last weekend, from the 23rd to the 26th, the U of A was hosting a Golden Bear Racquetball Tournament. Over 150 people were entered, among whom were the Canadian National B. champion, and some of the top players in the province. There was no mention in *the Gateway* of this tournament. Other sports are given coverage by you. Why not racquetball?

Heide Holst  
Arts 3

A free society, in my view, is caught on the horns of a pretty nasty dilemma: government is required to maintain civilization, yet, government itself is the greatest threat to civilization. (Need I go further to justify this last than to mention the word 'Watergate').

Government has been, is, and always will be an organization which has a monopoly on the legal use of force. Granted, government is elected by a majority, but remember it *enforces* laws. In essence, the modus operandi of government reduces to the following algorithm: "Do it or else we'll march you to jail at gunpoint." For the concept of freedom to have meaning it is necessary for the citizenry to have some control over just what it is they are being forced to do.

Free speech as a first line of defence against the tyrannical usurpation of power, permits the mounting of public opinion against the government if it goes further than the people are willing to let it go. Free speech is moral suasion, moral pressure, electoral pressure. The action of free speech reduces to this algorithm: "You guys in Ottawa shouldn't do that; it's not nice, it's not moral, and if you keep on doing what you're doing, we're going to vote you out of office."

This algorithm works well in many societies, but only under the condition that the government is willing to abide by the dictates of the electoral process. What if they say "to hell with your elections" and put troops on every block a circumstance which is not unusual in the course of human history then what? What if Richard Nixon had read *Seven Days In May*?

Free speech isn't worth a damn in these circumstances and people are forced to a more fundamental defence of freedom. You either buckle under to tyranny or you revolt. The right to bear arms is the symbol of the right to revolt. This symbol always before government, reminding them that they are in office only by the leave and permission of the people who elected them; they are therefore on ever-constant notice that they are the *servants*, not the *masters*, of the people.

If the citizenry relinquishes the right to bear arms, then realize that, at least symbolically, they are relinquishing their mastery over the government.

In light of all this, it is my fervent hope that the academic community protests the very idea of this Bill as loudly, as vigorously, and as eloquently as they have protested infringements of the right of free speech. I fear that if people remain silent the full effects of this Bill's passage won't be seen for nine years.

Brent Bissell

AR, FAR AWAY, IN A LAND WHERE THE SCREAMING ARCTIC WINDS POLISH SPIRES OF BLUE ICE INTO SHAPES NOT UNLIKE DRAGONS, TROLLS AND IRVING TUBESTEIN LIVED A BRAWNY, BRAWLING, LUSTY, HORNY, DRUNKEN SLOB OF A BARBARIAN YOUTH WHO WENT BY THE NAME OF GRUNTCAKES. HE LIVED IN THIS FROZEN CIMMERIA LEADING A PASTORAL EXISTANCE— DRINKING, BALLING, FIGHTING, BALLING, DRINKING...

