

Swell Guys, swelled heads

It's frightening to think that students who express their opinions in the *Gazette* do so at risk.

Last Friday night at the Grawood the band "Swell Guys" directed personal and insulting jokes toward a woman who had written a letter to the editor complaining about the content of their music.

The scene got uglier before it got better.

Besides challenging this woman to identify herself in the Grawood they even went so far as using her name instead of Dolly's in a rousing rendition of "Dolly Parton's Tits".

Apparently, some people in the Grawood interpreted this as an invitation to add derogatory comments like, "I wouldn't say she is easy, but she has seen more ceilings than Michelangelo."

Singling out this woman and making her a victim of jeers, insults

and sexist humour is a hostile act, and it's called harassment.

And it's not funny. These "Swell Guys" have abused their position as entertainers in order to seek revenge.

The Swell Guys could have ended their attack with their letter to the editors in this week's *Gazette*. But to these "guys" that's not enough "fun".

In response to our complaints about their treatment of the situation the Swell Guys responded "you can always leave." The Grawood is a bar for students.

Our student council runs this building, hires staff and administers services. We have a right to complain when these services offend us and they have a responsibility to listen and act.

When we leave the Grawood on a Friday afternoon after hearing Kenny Alex and the Swell Guys can we take our student union fees with us? □



The deadline for letters to the editor is noon, Monday before publication. Letters must be signed and include a telephone number where the author can be reached (although telephone numbers will not be printed with the letters). Letters are subject to editing for style, brevity, grammar, spelling, and libel. Letters can be dropped at the SUB enquiry desk, mailed to our address (on page 2), or brought up to the *Gazette* offices, third floor, SUB.

Non-smokers have rights too

To the editors,

"All you non-smokers ever think about are your rights, but remember smokers have rights too," this comment was made at a meeting I was attending. At first I was surprised, but when I sat down and thought about what had been said I suddenly realized that a real human rights issue does exist.

If all people have rights, how do we overcome the problem of conflicting rights? How can one person have the right to smoke while another has the right to breathe clean air? Who gives the smoker the right to damage their health and then expect society to pay for their long term health care? Where does one person's rights end and those around them begin?

I suggest that the division between peoples' rights be based on criteria that your rights only extend until it becomes harmful to those around them. If you wish to smoke it should be permitted but only in areas restricted to smokers and those who don't give a damn about their health. Human beings have the right to destroy their health but not at the expense of others.

Truly concerned
Amanda-Lynn Penny

Not a sex object

To the editors,

Recently my photograph appeared in the *Tupper Times* above an article submitted by the Dalhousie Nursing Society. At first I thought the placement of the picture a little odd as I am a medical student and not a nursing student, but I figured that the picture was just used as a space filler. I certainly was not insulted by the fact that some people would assume I was a nursing student, and I am sorry that the Nursing Society is insulted that I could be construed to be a nursing student.

There are a few things in the letter from the Society which upset me though. I resent the implication made by the Dal School of Nursing that I am an "inferior jelly brain sex object". If they believe that my picture portrays nurses in this manner than surely they are saying the same thing about me. I am a mature and intelligent individual and I doubt that anyone has ever considered me a "sex object". I also resent the accusation that the picture depicted me "submissively posed on my knees". It would have been very hard for me to pose at all, as I was climbing a rock face of one of Cape Breton's more scenic waterfalls. As for my attire, I usually wear a "summer outfit" in the heat of a summer afternoon.

I don't believe that my picture portrayed a negative image of women. Surely women today, even intelligent thinking women, are permitted to smile and enjoy themselves. Just because I was blessed with a few brains in my head doesn't mean I must roam around looking somber. Intelligence has nothing to do with the way a person looks, and yet just from looking at my picture the Dal School of

Nursing inferred something of my moral and intellectual condition. Remember, you can't judge a book by its cover.

I would also like to address some of D. Meggison's remarks. In Mr. Meggison's letter, he wrote of stereotyping women and how the *Tupper Times* and my photo was doing that very thing, and yet he has committed the sin he wrote of. He made some very stereotypical remarks about me and about what my picture implied. Shame on you Mr. Meggison. He also stated that females at the Dal Med School "seem to be some sort of prize or property or even meat" that male med students "lust, leer and lunge after." What kind of fools do you think we medical women are? Do you think we would put up with being treated in such a demeaning manner? Of course we wouldn't!! I attend classes with and study with the male students he has accused and I have never been treated in a disrespectful manner. I certainly have never been alluded to as an "inferior jelly brain sex object". I expect and receive respect from my fellow classmates both male and female. Non-sexist attitudes and equal rights are more than just being respected by men. True sexism will be eliminated when a picture of a smiling female will not elicit such negative comments from others, nor cause them to assume the worst about her or what she represents.

I feel an apology is in order.

Michelle Conrod
Med II

Tupper Times sexist, tasteless

To the editors,

Many thanks for your recent publication of letters concerning the *Tupper Times*, a newspaper of whose existence I had, up until

now, been blissfully unaware. Rarely does business take me to the Tupper Building; still more rarely do copies of this organ of the medical sciences crawl uphill to intrude upon the cloistered existence of Arts students.

I have, however, taken the opportunity to scrutinize this recently-exposed faecal specimen, and find myself compelled to agree with criticisms contained within your recent letters. The *Tupper Times* is sexist, tasteless, and entirely lacking in literary redeeming features. It is yet another of the whimpers with which the world will end.

My only hope is that, if the *Tupper Times* cannot be improved, it will not resume publication in the New Year.

Peter F. Dawson

Relax a bit

To D. Meggison of the Dalhousie Nursing Society, re the picture accompanying the "Dal Nursing Society News" in the *Tupper Times*,

How dare you talk about my sister in that fashion. She has no cleavage, and if your cleavage is not as good as hers I can definitely see why you're miffed.

More seriously, if you say my sister portrays an "inferior jelly brain sex object", then you are being sexist by drawing conclusions purely on the basis of her good looks.

As for her "posing submissively on her knees", she was cliff climbing in Cape Breton, a rather difficult feat to accomplish while upright.

If you can take a harmless picture like that and show it to be sexist, then you're looking so hard you're going to find sexism everywhere. Maybe you should just relax a bit.

Cheryl Conrod
Med II

Signed away right to whine

To the editors,

In your Nov. 8, 1984 edition, I found your article entitled "Fenwick Towers kicks students out in middle of exams", to be a poor attempt to gain sympathy for a number of reasons.

First, these students have no right to complain. They knew that they would have to vacate their apartments in mid-April and have to find other accommodations.

Secondly, their lease may be different from that of Howe and Sherriff Hall, but they knew those terms, accepted them and signed the lease, therefore "signing away" their right to whine and complain about it later.

Thirdly, a previous resident of the Towers asked in your article, "What is the extra cost for Dalhousie to allow the students to stay there till they have completed their exams?" Well while it may not cost the university anything, John Graham, manager of university services, defends the Towers in saying that since most of the residents are seniors, and don't have any exams, they are usually finished by the 15th; therefore vacating the premises at that time saves the majority of the residents a fair amount of money.

A lease, whether written or oral is a legally binding contract, and the parties involved have a legal obligation to respect and uphold the terms of such an agreement. So these specific residents should show themselves for the mature, responsible adults they are supposed to be, and instead of complaining, begin to make alternate arrangements for their "inconvenience".

Roxann Williams
TYP Program,
Dal University