



Very typical Aggies. Though hardly a cultural event Bar None does have some social significance, since (by their own estimates) about 800 people attend their annual dance and general drunk. Pick up a copy of **Bar None Dispatch** for details on the armwrestling contest, the pancake breakfast, the parade, etc.

Women and sexual destiny

by Ken Larsen

How do you begin to deal with oppression - when it takes the guise of science and biology? And how do you isolate the many factors used to establish and perpetuate a "sexual" oppression?

These are the problems of Evelyn Reed, noted author of *Woman's Evolution* and *Problems of Women's Liberation*, discussed Friday evening at the Edmonton Centennial Public Library.

"Only with a sound theoretical basis can women begin to understand the historical causes of their present oppression," she said. The first step in this process is to deal with the false rationalizations used to justify women's oppression in this patriarchal class society."

The first such false rationalization, she asserted, is the assumption of female biological inferiority. This theory contends that child bearing females are necessarily dependent on males and this is the reason for the low social position of females. Many staunch feminists, such as

Simone de Beauvoir have helped to perpetuate this "biological absurdity," Reed said. "but, in fact, we know that in pre-civilized groups the rearing and care of children was a communal undertaking and in these matriarchal groups women were always the economic and political equals of men."

Reed also took issue with men who argue, as anthropologist Martin Harris did, using a sort of "double-speak." These people agree with "culture as the gate keeper of sexual destiny" - they contradict themselves by contending that females have always been oppressed as a result of determinant (ie. biological) reasons. This biological absurdity merely provides a convenient excuse for ignoring the repressive nature of our society, Reed contended.

In her analysis, Reed contends that females were the actual creators of civilization. "In the hunter/gatherer society, it was the females who first engaged in the essentials of civilization: agricultural production, the building of shelters, and development of

more sophisticated communication, i.e. language; all this while the men were out hunting." In this clan of brothers and sisters neither sex was dominant.

Females in the "matriarchal clan" gained power as a result of their settlement-producing activities, good judgement, persuasion and example, said Reed. This contradicts the sort of "military thesis" which many

more REED see page 2



Evelyn Reed

HUB damage deposit refunded

by Kim St. Clair

Tenants vacating HUB this April may not be charged as much for apartment-cleaning as they have in the past.

Two HUB residents were granted refunds Monday on their HUB damage deposit when Judge Feehan ruled that certain cleaning charges should be absorbed by the landlord and not the client. \$51.83 was returned to the HUB tenants, Greg Noval and David Chapman, which amount had been taken out of their damage deposit to cover the cost of rug shampooing.

Judge Feehan stated that soiled rugs are the result of normal wear and tear, and therefore shampooing costs should not accrue to tenants.

It is not yet known whether this case will set a precedent whereby all HUB residents will be exempt from rug sham-

pooring costs. If this should prove true, said SU General Manager Harry Goldberg, "the Students' Union will have to reassess its position."

Mr. Goldberg felt confident that if the transfer of HUB to the university is successful, "the university will probably go along with the ruling."

The ruling was made after the Students' Union appealed a previous decision on the same case.

At the beginning and end of school terms HUB experiences a high turnover which its cleaning staff cannot handle all at once. At these times janitorial work is contracted out at a commercial rate of \$6 per hour, which cost is then levied on the tenants. At the initial hearing it was decided that Noval and Chapman should not have to pay \$6 per hour cleaning charges but that they need only

pay the \$3.50 per hour normally charged by SU employees.

According to this ruling, says Harry Goldberg, all future cleaning would have to be done by either the limited SU staff or by commercial contractors. In the latter case, which he claims would be the most likely to occur, the result would be students paying a higher overall amount for cleaning.

The two HUB tenants originally took action against the Students' Union because they felt that the \$109 taken from their damage deposit to cover cleaning costs was exorbitant. It was established that they had spent approximately twelve hours cleaning their apartment before vacating it last April.

In two previous years they had only been charged \$9 on the same account.

CANADIAN SELL-OUT

by Greg Neiman

"All of you are unique in that you have allowed to happen in your country what no other country would have allowed," said Mel Hurtig to a capacity crowd in Tory Lecture hall last Wednesday.

"Through your apathy, and your selfishness, and your laziness, you have allowed the virtually unreserved sellout of your country."

Local publisher, author, lecturer, and "internationalist," Hurtig explained his view of the political and economic ramifications of Canada's policy regarding foreign ownership, and added a report of what he and others have been doing about it.

"While it's clear today that the so-called 'new nationalists' have unquestionably lost the war, they did win many battles," he said, "we shifted public opinion. We shifted the politicians not an inch, but we shifted dramatically public opinion."

On the subject of politicians' views regarding foreign ownership, Hurtig quoted three of Canada's prominent politicians, Pierre Trudeau, Robert Bourassa and Peter Lougheed.

Trudeau was quoted as telling American businessmen "don't worry" about the Foreign Ownership Control Board's regulations.

"We in Alberta love foreign investment," said Premier Lougheed to businessmen in his last European tour.

"Personally, I believe there is no fundamental difference between Canadian capital and American capital," said Quebec's premier Bourassa.

Hurtig also quoted *The Financial Times* regarding Canada's latest policy on foreign ownership - the Phase I and Phase II "screening" of potential foreign investors:

"It would be difficult to imagine a legitimate business venture that would be impeded by Phase I of Phase II of the Board," said the article, written by an American businessman.

Not only has Canada allowed the wholesale vending of its properties, resources, and industries, it has actually forwarded foreign investors the money to do it, said Hurtig.

In 1970-72, American ownership of Canada grew by billions of dollars yet only 11% of the takeover was funded by Americans in 1970, 4% in '71,

and 6% in '72. The rest came from Canadian banks, trust companies, and other lending institutions.

"The next time you hear a politician, economics professor, teacher or Chamber of Commerce representative tell us that we need foreign investment, you tell him we've put up the money ourselves anyway."

In 1950-74, Hurtig said foreign investors brought about 20.3 billion dollars into Canada when during this period, foreign ownership grew by about 50-60 billion dollars.

"How much do you think they sent back home?" Hurtig asked. About seven billion left Canada as interest payments, 17 billion in dividends, and 17 in "monkey business" - service charges, payments to subsidiary companies, etc.

"The more foreign capital we accept," he said, "the more this country is going to be hemorrhaged to death, the more your children are going to have a huge debt to pay."

To make the point more clear, Hurtig said that in 1976 12 thousand dollars will leave Canada every minute in interest, dividends, and "monkey business."

"In the light of this fact, how can it be that Trudeau, Lougheed and Bourassa can say the things they have?"

The irony, though, said Hurtig, is that because Canada is owned and controlled by other countries, most Canadians can't speak out against it.

"A man with a wife and kids, who has a mortgage, and insurance, and a car, if he happens to work for IBM or Safeway, or some other foreign-owned company, will not stand up to a public meeting and say 'let's stop the sellout of our country.'"

And his wife won't either, and probably his children won't. "You have more and more Canadians who are eunuchs in their own country."

However, Hurtig said it was still not too late to stop what's happening. He said it was still possible, through a comprehensive, well-planned program of taxation, incentives, laws, and regulations, to halt or even roll back the massive amount of foreign ownership in Canada.

"If you really care, if you really want to do something, you have to get off your rear end and get into politics," he said.



Mel Hurtig