

BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of the Brunswickan. Letters may be sent to Rm. 35 in the Student Union Building. Deadline: 1 pm on Tuesday. Usual maximum length: 300 words. Please include name, student number and phone number.

Misquoted in Viewpoint

To the Iranian Graduate Students, Hasan Ghodrati and to Whom it May Concern,

We would like to clear up, with all due respect, the confusion caused by our response to the Viewpoint question of Feb. 5's *Brunswickan*. In the section, we were indeed misquoted as saying "33% of Persian women have had sex in a movie theatre." No such thing was ever uttered by either of us and was merely a misprint on the part of the *Brunswickan*. Anyone who knows us is correct in saying that we may not be the most politically correct people in the world, but if there is anything that we *are not*, it's racist or sexist.

The original quote: "33% of Parisian women..." (which, also, out of context could be taken as sexist) was meant to poke fun at the fact that someone would take the time and effort to ask anyone whether or not they had had sex in a movie theatre - as if it matters at all. This is just the sort of statistic which perpetuates cultural myths and is completely useless and trivial. In light of the viewpoint question "Stupid pick-up lines.", we were merely pointing out the ignorance in the perpetuation of such myths.

In closing, we hope that we have cleared up these allegations. We apologize sincerely to the addressees of this letter, and hope that they understand that our comments were not aimed at anyone in particular, but at humanity's incessant need to know trivial things. Please don't hold the *Brunswickan's* mistake against us.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Trites
and Ted Hamilton

Ed note: The Brunswickan wishes to apologize to Jennifer Trites and Ted Hamilton for misquoting them.

Dialogue with a Tory

Dear Editor,

"What is termed 'disrespect for law' in fact may only be the manifestation of a burning desire for justice... Disrespect for an order that does not deserve respect ought not to be condemned as degeneration, but commended as a healthy regeneration." J. C. McRuer, *Former Chief Justice of Ontario*.

The campus Conservative establishment is stricken with the fear of failing to dupe student voters. It scrambles to discredit in any way the voices of those who call its worth into question. Specifically, the petty, personal attacks on the ethical character of Tony Tracy and myself in *Blood & Thunder* last week. Discrediting the witnesses, especially the witnesses who speak the truth, is a typically Tory tactic.

To debate the goings-on at PC-Youth events is also petty. Al-

though Dennis McCarron spoke at length on that subject in last week's *Blood & Thunder*, his lecture only concealed the issue at hand. To bicker over whose 'facts' are the least biased is ludicrous at best. (One interesting point Dennis McCarron raised, however, was that of the excessive consumption of alcohol at said event).

THE POINT. My ethics were called into question. In comparison, I infer, to PC ethics. And what are these 'ethics'? ('ethic' — from the Greek *ethos* "character", from which English derives 'ethos' "the spirit of a people, group or culture").

After a brief but enthusiastic dialogue with a young Tory, the following PC 'ethic' took shape before my eyes: the absolute sanctity of private property. As Jim McGee spoke, it was as if John Locke's ideology whispered in each breath: "It is plain that men [people] agreed to a disproportionate and unequal possession of the earth." (*On Liberty*, 1764. The modern impact of Lockean principles is profound. Read Chapter V, "Of Property", its [sic] only ten pages).

In Conservative culture, these principles essentially manifest three aspects: one, the unalienable right to the unlimited use of land resources for unlimited profit; two, the responsibility of government to foster this use of the land; and three, the implicit necessity of a class structure — landowners and non-landowners. More than concern for poisoned waters, or children too hungry to be educated, Tory & Co. Ltd. promotes the philosophy of enriching the rich, and raping the earth. That may be conscionable for PC-Youths, who snuggle up to politicians to indulge in the politics of greed, but what of people outside the circles of lawyers, the Cabinet and their courtesans?

The Tory agenda ignores the spirit of our citizens and lands. The Tory & Co. Ltd. legacy is their antipathy for our ailing culture beyond its free market value. The Tory attempt to speak for our people is a failure. We have shared our dreams with soulless creatures. Our health is in the shaking hands of

arrogant surgeons. Our voice to the world mimics the puppet of a bitter warrior. Is our earth for the Mid-Asian kings, and our lives to be their slaves?

"Toryism has been the curse of civilized world — the meaning of it is to exalt and pamper a few individuals in luxuriant indolence at the expense of the sweat and toil and degradation of the great mass of industrious [hu] mankind." *Thomas MacQueen, Canadian poet.*

Jon Sears

To "The Cybermage"

Dear Editor,

To "The Cybermage" concerning (his?) article in *Soundcheck* of last week:

RPGs are a recent popular art form, and as such, are not racist/sexist/anti-gay in themselves. I suspect, though, you already understand this, and your complaint is that all or the majority of the RPG business, i.e., the actual content and background of the majority of published games, contain those biases.

I cannot address the majority of your claims as they are rather brief and vague without specific examples I can investigate. I can explain the first incident, concerning the cover to the product you purchased: most artist contracts in the RPG business give the artist free rein over the cover, and TSR was likely obliged to publish the cover as it came. If you wish to blame someone, it is not TSR you should blame but the individual artist.

RPGs have become socially aware over the years, the main force of this coming from the newer companies. (Your comment that the creators of the first-generation games control the gaming business is untrue.) I won't rattle off a list of example for sake of letter space; you may contact me for them if you wish, I will be glad to give them to you.

The RPG business, like Hollywood or the bestseller publishing industry, is certainly not saintly or sublimely open minded. But there

is more to the industry than you say; RPGs mirror the rest of the world just like other pop culture, being composed of individuals connected to the rest of the world. And of course, do remember the first rule. And of course, do remember the first rule of RPGs; you are free to refuse any game, ruling, or background you please. If you wish it, you can make your own changes.

Sean Givan

Pornography devalues women

Dear Editor,

I was thoroughly disturbed and appalled by a recent conversation which took place between a very good male friend and myself. The topic of discussion was *pornography*. We were discussing posters in which women with size 38D chests were wearing swimwear two times too small for their given measurements. The woman held her head back running her fingers through her hair with her chest stuck out - a photograph clearly portraying eroticism. It was obvious in my estimation, that this was considered pornography. Let's define pornography. One such definition went as follows - written, *graphic* or other forms of communication intended to excite lascivious feelings. Another - photography intended to arouse sexual excitement (Ameri-

can Heritage Dictionary).

According to my friend these photos were not pornographic, nor harmful, nor meant to "arouse sexual excitement". They were pictures of beautiful women with perfect bodies that men like to look at. My question is why do they like to look at them? To tell me a female body with a chest size "larger than life" being portrayed in an erotic, sexual way, does not arouse sexual excitement for a male is absolutely ridiculous [sic].

I posed this question to him. What is the difference between such posters and *Playboy* magazines? His reply was *In Playboy*, women are completely naked! Correct me if I'm wrong, but I see no difference between viewing a woman totally naked and one where she is hardly covering anything. The body is still the emphasis.

The point I guess is that considered pornography or not, these sorts of photographs exploit women by viewing them as sex objects. When will men realize there's more to women than their physical beauty, whether it be the face or the body? When will men look beyond our bodies, after all we all know beauty is only skin deep!

There is nothing perverted nor dirty about the human body. However, such images devalue women so that they are only given recognition for their physical beauty and men can't help but view women as mere sex objects.

Name withheld


chsr fm
STEREO 97.9

FUNdrive '93

There will be a screening of Roman Polanski's Chinatown on Thursday, Feb 25th at 8:00pm in McLaggan Hall.

Admission is \$2.00 (at the door)

All proceeds go to benefit CHSR-FM as part of FUNdrive '93.



Is food a problem for you?



- Do you eat when you're not hungry?
- Do you go on eating binges for no apparent reason?
- Is your weight affecting the way you live your life?

Call
OVEREATERS ANONYMOUS
NO dues • NO fees • NO weigh-ins • NO diets
We are a Fellowship

Phone:
Lil Bob Genevive
455-2157 454-0028 459-7265