

LETTERS

cont'd from

You Goddamned Son of a Bitch" by The Revolting Cocks.

These selections might be some of CHRY's favourites but I, for one, surely don't believe that they are representative of the student population's musical tastes. Who has even heard of them?

Financial support for CHRY obtained via a levy should be denied on the basis that most students, the ones who are paying, couldn't care less about the station. Since the station's operating and capital expenses are also made up through radio sponsorships and public fund raising efforts, those students and fans of alternative music still wishing to contribute could continue to do so. There is no rationale for every student to give part of their tuition fee towards a project they're apathetic about. \$100,000 of student money could be put into far more popular and worthwhile undertaking.

Andrew Lee

Abortion is "non-viable"

To the York community c/o the Editor:

What is at issue in the abortion controversy anyway? There are some who would have us misled that all pro-abortionists are immoral humanists who endorse promiscuity, support alternate sexual orientations, and decry a belief in God. Such arguments are readily refuted, but the belief is unfortunately perpetuated, potentially fueling tensions. Then there are some who would have us believe that all anti-abortionists "have a broader agenda" than their anti-abortion campaigns. They convolute issues by saying that anti-abortionists are also anti-daycare, anti-homosexuals, and definitely pro-religion. Such lies are again easily refuted, but again, the tensions are escalated by meaningless, thoughtless politicizing.

In order to accurately understand

the abortion controversy and to think clearly of our personal position in that controversy, it is necessary to isolate the issue from the tremendously large "cluster" of beliefs that accompany it. In essence, then, I will posit that the issue of abortion boils down to two "inalienable privileges" — *freedom* and *life*. Ordinarily, these two privileges do not clash in intent and, in the interest of space, I will not discuss the situations where they agree.

But in abortion, ah, we have a conflict. The pro-abortionist cries freedom — the right to choose what to do with one's own body; the right to make a decision concerning one's own pregnancy. No other person, by law or by political and social pressure, should take away that freedom. The anti-abortionist, on the other hand, cries life. There are two lives involved, the mother's and the child's. They contend that both lives (not just the child's) are adversely affected by abortion — in one, the emotional trauma; in the other, the extinguishing of life through processes such as dismemberment, chemical poisoning, and the like. As the jury to life's dilemma, whom do we believe? Which do we consider the higher moral calling?

There are some facts to which we have to acquaint ourselves before we embark on such a profound decision. First, sexual intercourse must be the *choice* of two persons. If the freedom of one is violated, then provision must be given for an individualized decision concerning the product of that intercourse. But following the full exercise of choice (whether out of ignorance or ignominy) the pregnancy that results now involves three persons, two of whom are by nature linked. One, the mother, is able to exercise freedom; the other, the child in fetal form, cannot. Can one exercise freedom at the expense of life? Can one advance the argument that since the other is totally dependent and has no opportunity for existence apart from the host choose to terminate that life? I have carefully avoided the philosophical puzzlement of when life actually begins, but I do not think that any would disagree with me that the mother seeks an abortion because

she knows that she is *ultimately* riding herself of a baby and not simply a chunk of cells.

I would empathize (though not agree) with those favouring abortion who say that any man opposing abortion cannot understand how a woman feels. (Tautologically, these also say that any man *agreeing* to abortion, can!) Personally, I will underscore my belief that *choice* can only be inalienable if it does not violate *life* . . . and that this principle should operate not only in abortion, but also in numerous other moral decisions. For that reason, and for many others which I have not the space to elucidate, I must also urge you to decide that abortion is indeed a non-viable option in the exercise of freedom. I also cannot at the present outline the numerous viable options available to one who has rejected abortion, though such information is readily available.

Let me close with an abortion parable to which I know both men and women can relate:

My father is very old. In fact, he's so old that after my mother died, he could not live on his own. I made an *initial* choice, which I now regret, of promising mother he could live at my house until he passed away. It was an unfortunate, but irrevocable choice. You see, Dad is now totally dependent on me. He lives in *my* house; he eats *my* food; he sleeps in *my* bed; he uses *my* money. He is in contact with no one else, and is a burden to none other than me. Then I reasoned to myself: I have a life to lead! This is *my* house, *my* food, *my* bed, *my* money. This man owes his present existence to me, and only to me. Now, he is an inconvenience, and I want to exercise my privilege of freedom. Allow me to provide you with one gruesome solution: kill him; dismember him; poison him; dispose of him. In the destruction of his life, I buy my freedom.

My dear reader, if you are irked by that solution on a life that has exhausted many good years on the face of the earth, why will you not have compassion on a life that has as yet so much potential as that of a little child's?

T. Quek

Graduate Student, Psychology

Women are "victimized"

Editor,

In response to the letter of Gavin C. Miller (*Excalibur*, Jan. 19, 1989).

Unfortunately, the victimization of women is a fact in today's society. Though one day we may achieve "a radical responsibility by the male for his own sexuality" this would not make free access to abortion obsolete. Furthermore, although birth control and sex education are valuable components in preventing unwanted pregnancies, they are not 100 per cent effective.

Though we understand that anti-abortionists have been subjected to stereotypes, many of us who believe in the right to abortion have had our views misinterpreted as well. We have been portrayed as people who are accepting the lesser of two evils, the life of the foetus for the convenience of the mother. Many of us, however, feel that the foetus at early stages of development does not constitute a human being anymore than the mixture of sperm and egg in a petrie dish. The process of artificial insemination has allowed couples to have children who are wanted. However, several dozens of fertilized eggs are discarded in the process. This has not been a major issue in the abortion controversy, but in essence . . . raises the same questions.

We believe that if society can accept artificial insemination, it should, in principle, accept abortion. If the pro-lifers wish to be consistent in their beliefs they should be holding funerals for every miscarriage!!!

Leesa Beales
Sheila Holyer
Robert Fantinato

Parliament "memorable"

Editor,

It could have been better, but not as interesting. York University's first official model parliament began with

little glamour, and ended with a very big bang. (The Liberal party knows this.) It proved to be a memorable experience for all involved.

In one weekend, this parliament had the makings of any parliament or legislature in Canada. It began with a Throne Speech by Governor-General John Saywell; the presence of Toronto — Bill Atwell, and Alan Redway — and, of course, the participation of nearby York MPs. Most characteristics were also covered such as expulsion of members; intense debate; heavy cheering; and partisan pounding on pseudo-Hansard desks.

A load of thanks has to go to CYSF's Tammy Hasselfeldt and Joe Zammit for their tremendous support. Joe also gave a performance, as Minister of the Environment, that shows there is a place for him in Ottawa in future years. The Honourable David Gilinsky should also be thanked for his "John Crosbyish" role of party whip. He fit the role.

To the Liberals (Steve Thiele), the NDP (David Hanley), and the Progressive Conservatives — here's to next year.

Stephen Reid

Director-At-Large
Model Parliament,

York Progressive Conservatives

Jolly Roger Coalition

Dear Editor:

Finally, a campus political organization that even a flaky, uninformed Fine Arts student like myself can debunk — The Liberty Coalition. Pleased to see they're receiving so much attention as of late. I feel brainy whenever they're mentioned.

Is that debate still going on about their using the US flag as their club banner? Y'know, they could use the Jolly Roger. Underneath the crossbones they could write, "The hell with you, Jack, I've got mine!" and they'd have as close to a universal symbol of "Enlightened Self-Interest" as you can get.

Love,
Robert Butz

Sport
York
Mexicana Night

Shoot for Mexico Finals!

Yeomen Hockey vs. Concordia
Friday, January 27, 1989 7:30 p.m. York Ice Arena

WIN
1st Prize Trip for two to Acapulco courtesy of Butterfield and Robinson Travel.
2nd Prize Two Canrail passes compliments of Via Rail Canada.
3rd Prize Limo cruise for an evening courtesy of Royal Crown Livery.

Royale Crown Livery
BUTTERFIELD & ROBINSON TRAVEL CENTRE Central Square
TACO BELL
CYSF
VIA VIA Rail Canada Inc.

READING WEEK
FROM
499
CANCUN • PUERTO VALLARTA
CUBA • COLUMBIA
Different Options:
All-Inclusive
Semi-Inclusive
All You Can Drink
For More Information Call: STEPHAN 739-6069
RTS Richardson's
Travel Store Inc.

SIGHTSEEING GUIDES WANTED

Students needed for part-time service as Sightseeing Bus Tour Guides Year-Round (Peak Season April to October).

Good command of the English language mandatory.
Must speak a second language, preferably French, German, Spanish, Italian, Dutch or Japanese.
Must have a pleasing personality and appearance.
Familiarity with Toronto helpful, but not essential
WILL TRAIN.

Forward completed resume by February 22

BONNIE LONG
RECEPTION ONTARIO
3845 BATHURST STREET, SUITE 401
DOWNSVIEW, ONTARIO
M3H 3N2
NO PHONE CALLS PLEASE!