

# Neo-Nazis invade Dalhousie

*What ever happened to tolerance in the university?*

While waiting for a friend in the Dunn building last week, I noticed a poster lying on the floor. I almost tossed it into the recycling bin, but noticed a disturbing graffiti message on it — "FOR NEO-NAZIS ONLY." The poster advertised Dalhousie Christian Fellowship's Friday night meetings at the SUB. I decided to find out if this group of people who call themselves Christians were racist bigots. After some research, I discovered some disturbing things.

It seems that Dal Christian Fellowship (DCF) has quite a history of bizarre activities on campus. This year they walked around our campus and PRAYED for every faculty, anonymously cleaned some campus buildings covered with pigeon crap, gave tours of Halifax and a barbecue at no cost to Frosh, and held a free coffee crawl to provide people with a nonalcoholic entertainment alternative. To top it all off, this all happened during Frosh week. I was horrified when I found out they raised more money for Shinerama than any other Dal 'B' society.

I investigated their Friday meetings — they talked openly about a variety of current affairs-type issues and welcomed Q & A style discussion after the evening's talk. They even went so far as to hold a meeting specifically about infiltrating our campus with random acts of kindness. This is serious business, Dal students — wake up and listen!!

I also investigated Sunday Night Live, a DCF event in our very own Grawood. It presented music and drama that blatantly promoted values like love, acceptance, forgiveness, and personal freedom.

## OPINION

THIS MADNESS MUST END! THE CHRISTIANS MUST BE STOPPED AT ALL COSTS! IF DCF is allowed to continue with these degrading and disgusting measures, you may come into contact with these vicious fascists, and THEY MAY TRY TO LOVE YOU!

This is all to pose this point. It's a shame that in a centre for academic excellence there are people, regardless of personal beliefs and personal causes, who assume that freedom of speech includes the freedom to slander and demean others. It's also a shame they make no attempt to investigate these people objectively and assess them honestly. Whoever graffitied that poster — I don't condemn you. Today, when we're supposed to be open-minded and tolerant of all people, before we open our mouths to say anything, please consider CAREFULLY what you're talking about before you defame it.

Maybe if we all took a little time to consider what we're about to say, we'd start to solve some of our problems with racism, sexism, homophobia, and the rest of society's evils that start on a tongue's tip. Freedom is bondage without responsibility.

**PAUL WOZNEY.**  
(PWOZNEY@IS.DAL.CA)

## OPINION

# Reclaiming feminism



"feminism" seems to evoke feelings of uneasiness all around. From my experience, women are generally quick to maintain that feminism is a good thing (really!). Men automatically get defensive when the topic is brought up. Being a feminist seems to require you to accuse men of treating women unjustly in countless ways; be stringently picky about anything dealing with women; and, of course, be infuriatingly politically correct — all in a loud, annoying manner. Oh, and you have to be female.

Feminism is too often reduced to this type of stereotypical drivel. But, it's not necessary to view feminism in a negative light; action taken in defense of women does not have to be interpreted as the action of "another radical feminist." Feminism doesn't have to be extremist, though this seems to be the prevailing view.

It is important to remember the real definition of "feminism," as defined by Webster's Dictionary — it is "the movement to win political, economic, and social equality for women." Hell, if being a feminist means that I'm fighting for my equality, count me in.

As long as women do not have the same opportunities as men and live under double standards, there will be a need for feminism. The term should be redefined to encompass all women and men who believe in the equality of women and strive to make this belief a reality in whatever way they can. The label should not be a source of embarrassment or shame, but rather the articulation of an important goal.

Sadly, as long as the term "feminism" is perceived as a negative label, it will serve only to stunt the progress of feminism itself. Use it as you wish.

**MICHELLE GREGUS**

WHEN I was fourteen years old, I proudly declared myself a feminist. I suppose I was naive back then because this proclamation was meant positively.

Strangely enough, my main source of inspiration was a teenage girls' magazine — according to "Sassy," being a feminist was cool. A feminist was a smart, confident girl who was not afraid of accomplishing something simply because she was a female; she was the hip older sister you wanted to emulate. The term "female" embodied strength, intelligence, and

opportunity. Perhaps ironically, "Sassy" has been reduced to a watered-down piece of crap — it is now owned by the same folks who run the gag-worthy "Teen" magazine.

It came as a mild shock to me, then, that not everyone shared my view of feminism so enthusiastically. Oh, I knew of the old stigma attached to the term, but I didn't expect radical notions of feminism to affect most people.

I couldn't have been more wrong.

Just mentioning the word

# Cigarette ads: All in a huff about nothing

Ethics are great. So is survival. The difficulty comes when one must balance one against the other. A recent decision by the Supreme Court of Canada to overturn a ban on tobacco advertisements has caught newspaper editors in a moral dilemma — do they run the ads or not?

Charlatan (Carleton university's newspaper) staff writer Alex Bustos claims that it is "ironic" for his paper, which readily criticizes government cutbacks, to then "place profits before its own principles."

This is an interesting statement which begs a number of questions. First, whose principles are we talking about? Mr. Bustos'? Is the newspaper for which he writes a monolithic entity with one voice? Does everyone on his staff share the same views that he does? (By his own admission, they do not).

Second, is it not ironic that there was such a ban in the first place? The last time I checked the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, I'm almost positive that I read something about the freedom of expression. Clearly, the Supreme Court of Canada did not

originally see fit for tobacco companies to be free to express themselves. And now it does. Which leads me back to my first point: whose principles are we talking about?

I personally find the Supreme Court's decision startling for a number of reasons. To begin with, it defies common logic for smoking to be legal but not advertisements for it, when prostitution is illegal but thinly veiled advertisements for it are not. Smoking tobacco is harmful to the body — that's a scientifically proven fact. It has also been scientifically proven that eating certain foods — such as cookies, cake, donuts, and greasy poultry — can also prove harmful to the body. Yet advertisements for Kentucky Fried Chicken spring eternal.

Oh yes — and isn't it a well established fact that tobacco is a drug like alcohol, cocaine, and caffeine? Caffeine is addictive but you don't have to be eighteen

years of age to buy a can of cola. Maybe Coke advertisements should also be banned along with Colonel Saunders'.

The issue of harmful advertising was addressed in the Concordia Link last year in an article entitled, "A Call to Boycott Christian Dior Ads." The ad is for Dior Svelte, a product which claims to melt away cellulite but which dermatologists say only gets rid of water temporarily. Cleverly photographed, it displays the side view of a naked child-like body wrapped in a bow. The message to women? Forget equality. You're still just pretty packages.

The executives at Christian Dior, while clearly not socially responsible, are not stupid either. Research studies have shown that just thirty minutes of television viewing is enough to profoundly affect a female's self-perception of her body type. Companies such as Christian Dior design ads with the explicit intention of capitalizing

on the insecurities and desires they create. Thus, a model who is likely in her teens is used to market a product at women over the age of thirty and present an unrealistic body image that becomes the commercialized norm.

The Dior Svelte ad contributes to unrealistic expectations of body size, which may cause females to develop illnesses such as anorexia nervosa. It objectifies women by depicting a female model as a wrapped gift; hence the big, red bow. And, it sexually exploits women by showing an unnecessary close-up of a woman's torso.

Ads such as this are intolerable in a supposedly egalitarian society. Every time a little boy or girl sees this ad on the street or on TV, a powerful message is portrayed about the role of women in society. Advertising has an enormous impact on all of our lives; if it was ineffective, companies wouldn't spend millions of dollars every year promoting their products.

The Dalhousie Gazette welcomes letters to the editor and commentary. Letters are limited to 300 and commentary to 800 words in length. The deadline is noon on Mondays. To be printed, all submissions must be typed double spaced on paper, e-mailed, or on a Mac or IBM-compatible 3 1/2 inch disk.

**D.A. KNIGHT**