

princess refuses to submit

As the "choicest piece" in the Engineering Meat Market, I feel obliged to clarify my position with regards to Ms. Jackson's editorial comment in the January 30th edition of The Gateway. I do not purport to speak for the other candidates; I do, however, refuse to submit to the accusations of one quasi-liberationist editor.

Firstly, I was under no pressure to play the "male stereotype of womanhood." I did not "coily play dumb, inflating the egos of the male voters." Nor did I "demurely echo the males around me." However, I do concede this point to you, Ms. Jackson. I did not, nor had I occasion to display any exceptional "intelligence" or "confidently assert my own views". But realize, please, that Engineering Week is hardly an intellectual issue. I feel no less a woman for standing in front of an Engineering class, talking about the seemingly trivial events of the week rather than discussing the merits of foreign investment in Canada to flaunt my intellect. We all merely had a bit of (God forgive us) fun.

I do not recall being "inspected, prodded and set on display" — unless you consider the singing, dancing, laughing, clapping and getting to know one another to be in that classification. In fact, I fail to see where the blatantly sexual



Engineering Queen 1973

physical requirements of the candidates" were a major factor. The five candidates were hardly the creme de la creme d'etat de femme (and just for the record, Ms. Jackson, three of the five princesses were in the Frances Flatchest category). I will admit that people (men and women) are more receptive to a pleasing appearance. But this situation exists also in the real world, even (or perhaps especially) in the sacred world of politics. It is simply the same principle by which it is easier to kill a spider than a butterfly.

No, I was not exploited. You cannot exploit someone who does something with complete knowledge and consent. I believe (and you may accuse me of naivety, if you please) that I presented myself as a person with great enthusiasm for Engineering Week, not as a sex object whose sole purpose was "to convince club members to

defect and vote for me". Obviously, Mr. Scaman and Mr. Barabesh perceived me in such a way. You, who is so quick to oppose the stereotyping of women, do little to dispel the stereotyped image of engineers, (and all men, for that matter) as sex crazed rag dolls, blissfully manipulated by a pair of big boobs and an empty-headed smile. Perhaps you are not so liberated as you choose to think you are. It embarrasses me to see a sister weakly (and predictably) waving her little anti-sexism flag from any mole hill at the first glimmerings of a possible cause.

I wish to thank all those engineers who accepted me as a person and to assure you others that yes, the Engineering Queen is sufficiently literate to take time out from glueing on her false eyelashes to declare her "humanness".

Patricia Olasker
Arts I

princess breaks silence

As one of the women exploited by the said "sexist" event of Engineering Week 1973, I cannot remain silent when someone dares to liken me to a side of beef. Until this time, I have been a strong supporter of Women's Liberation movements. I believe in equality of opportunity; as an intelligent and educated human being, I demand the right to job status and remuneration equal to that of my male counterparts. However, must this equality mean that I am no longer appreciated as a woman? I enjoy the male mind and the male body. As a woman, I have some physical and mental attributes which men do not. I take joy and pride in the fact that the males in my world appreciate these attributes, and Ms. Jackson, if you are so caught up in being equal to men that you are missing the joys of being different from them, I can only pity you.

I was asked to be the figurehead and spokesman for a group of men for one week - an invitation I accepted with pride and thanks. In that capacity, I encouraged Engineers to come out and have a good time at the planned events. At the same time I suppose that I was soliciting votes - however, at no point did I "play dumb" or "demurely echo the males around me."

Figurehead and spokesman were only a part of my role during Engineering Week. I belonged to a group, organizing and campaigning in activities both entertaining and competitive. I do not think that

it would be immodest to say that I was part of the brains behind the outfit. My imagination and intelligence were taxed, as were those of everyone else involved. At all times I was "assertive of my own views" and not only do I respect my own intelligence but so do the men involved. I made many friends, gained invaluable experience, and I was at all times treated royally. If this is exploitation, then may I be "exploited" for the rest of my life!

Defenses against unjust allocations aside, I would like to thank Engineers everywhere for appreciating females as something more than their "equals" and thank U of A Engineers especially for one of the happiest and most exciting times of my life. It is my sincere hope that Engineering Week (with Queen candidates) will continue for many years to come.

To you, Ms. Jackson, and to those of you who share her sentiments, may I say if you haven't tried it, don't knock it and if you don't want to try it, have the decency not to insult those of us who wish to.

One more thing, as I am a woman who could rival the said "Frances Flatchest" and I am also the Princess who came in second (even though Ms. Jackson says I didn't have a prayer!) it is my suggestion that if you would quit viewing men as potential exploiters, you'd find that they are not really blind to the non-physical attributes of women.

Darlene Gardiner
Civil Engineering Princess, 1973

fourum five

hotly debated in this issue . . .

meat vs. mind
nationality vs. competence
Bissel vs. Neuman

fag is a bad word

I wish to protest the use of the term "fag" in Walter Plinge's otherwise fine review of the film "Pete 'n' Tillie."

"Fag" is a derogatory term which is insulting to the approximately ten percent of society (and ten percent of the student body at the University of Alberta) who are homosexual. It should also insult those heterosexuals concerned with the well-being of their fellow inhabitants on this earth.

The Gateway seems to wish to be regarded as a paper concerned with the welfare of ALL humans. You, as editor, seem particularly concerned that people be regarded as individuals rather than as stereotypes and that people not be regarded as objects. Yet, by allowing this term to be used, you, too, are guilty of stereotyping people and insulting their dignity as human beings.

It is all too easy to fight oppression and discrimination when it hits close to home while continuing to discriminate against those who are somewhat unknown. We must all realize that freedom for one group

MUST be extended to all oppressed minorities in society if we are to achieve a truly liberated, people-oriented society.

It is particularly important that supposedly responsible student newspapers insure that they do not contribute to oppression whether intentionally or not.

It is all too difficult to be a homosexual in our society without a student paper like the Gateway, otherwise vitally concerned with "people liberation," suddenly using a term like "fag" in a review.

You as editor and Walter Plinge as writer should apologize to campus homosexuals and to heterosexuals also offended by the use of this term.

Ken King
11111 - 87 Avenue

Editor's note: The point is well taken. Thank you for bringing to our attention a form of verbal sexism to which we had not been sensitized.

Terri Jackson
Walter Plinge

shattered by failure to void

Shattered, absolutely shattered I was to awaken to the realization at last Mondays council meeting that I no longer (if ever) had the power to clear the council chambers of all the infants who were present. Most, however did immediately oblige and stomped out, this minor disruption greatly aiding further discussion. Lest the reader think I'm only alluding to some character defect in those who left, doubt no more for it is an inherent fact that only the rattle was missing. But most of us councilors never seem to get it together long enough anyways at council meetings to objectively listen to proposals or requests which are not closely aligned with previous beliefs.

What was the issue and why the furor? Allow me to elaborate. At a time when foreign economic and cultural domination of this country is beginning (at last) to be realized as detrimental in such large proportions (99 percent oil refineries foreign owned, majority of book publishing foreign owned) it seems acceptable to follow the examples set by civic, provincial, and national governing bodies. It was with this in mind that I proposed to restrict executive and managerial positions of this students union to Canadians (here excluding British subjects). This is not suggest that the foreign students on this campus should have limited suffrage but only that the more important positions where many policy decisions are made should be limited to those persons who are

attuned to living in this country. Can or will an American or any foreign citizen in a top S.U. position push nationalism or give equal consideration to Canadians in hiring policy? He would probably not even consider it as a worthwhile issue. This is partially borne out by the fact that those university departments headed by Americans give preference to Americans over equally qualified Canadians.

Is this desire for Canadian content such a god-awful request or does it just seem so to the non-Canadians on council who must cry out vehemently in protest lest they lose access to their present or similar positions? Granted this S.U. is an organization funded by students who come from many different countries and who are obliged to pay S.U. fees, they should therefore be entitled to affect the operation of their S.U. It is not intended to deny anyone this right, for there are many positions from faculty reps to committee members where their inputs are welcomed and desired.

There are other factors which require some consideration.

1. It has been stated that a valuable benefit from foreign students is the cultural exchange. But there are some groups who are opposed to mixing and segregate themselves purposely (eg. Chinese Students Association at April 3 meeting of council "we wish to associate with our own kind. . ."). As to cultural mixing from the states, who needs more American

influence?

2. This motion was not directed against any minority or cultural groups nor did it intend to discriminate against any person due solely on the basis of country of origin, for almost anyone can become a Canadian citizen. Rather if discrimination exists, it is directed in favor of Canadians.

3. Who really pays? According to the latest published figures (1970-71 Board of Gov. Report) the average operating costs of this university per full-time student per year is \$3,357. The student pays anywhere from \$450-\$600 in fees the remainder of this cost paid by the Canadian taxpayer. So as Alberta residents we are subsidizing the cost of university education for every student, as Canadian taxpayers subsidizing living and travel expenses of some foreign students (foreign aid, grants, etc.) and now as students we are expected to pay non-canadians salaries to run this S.U. Where does it end?

Perhaps I'm in error and a gradual takeover and complete rather than partial domination of this nation as an entity is a desirable objective. Perhaps a country or region can contribute more effectively to world harmony when another nation speaks for it. And then, too, maybe nationalism should not start at this level. Yes, perhaps the 51st state is not such a bad thing and the economic and political advantages to be accrued speak in its favor. But then perhaps not.

Darryl Grams
Science Rep.