

# Students skewer Sproule Gateway sells sex

## sex

I would like to point out the discrepancy with what is preached and what is practiced within the Gateway. The editorial on Nov. 16 came out against sexist discrimination and for the GFC committee's (Standing Committee on Equal Opportunities) work towards battling this problem. In the same issue was an article "De-mystifying sex or what it means to be a person. Why Not!" On Nov. 23, a front page article stated "Gunning gears up for fight."

These articles were in support of women's equality but on the third page Nov. 23 issue an advertisement with a luscious-looking female unzipping her overalls was just another blatant example of sexist exploitation. The female in question had a suggestive pose, her head was turned in that teasing manner and her hand was unzipping the coveralls as to suggest there is more to come.

This form of advertising is definitely a good sales image. But anyone who has read the previous articles mentioned would have had a good laugh at the advertisement and the discrepancy that exists. Women have been used as sexual selling objects to sell such things as cigarettes, men's cologne, clothes, stereo equipment, liquor and cars. This type of blatant sexist propaganda, in which females are implied to be sexual objects that come with the purchase of products, has been prevalent in our society for many years. Gateway in their previous articles has made moves towards recognising some of the various forms of discrimination faced by women, but the advertisement from Gentry's leaves Gateway with their trousers down.

Manfred Lockhart  
Arts 3

**Ed. Note:** I agree with your point Mr. Lockhart and it was an inadvertent error which resulted in the printing of the Gentry's ad in question. Gateway's advertising policy is not to publish sexist, racist or other discriminatory ads and the Gentry's ad has been removed from the paper.

After reading David Sproule's denouncement of recent Gateway editorials as "non-sense," "prattle," and "comic relief," my friends and I wondered where the "practical" Mr. Sproule finds time from his "getting a good education" to put his thoughts on paper, narrow as they are.

My experience with University of Alberta students in general is that many are "unthinking pathetic blockheads" just as Mr. Sproule describes himself.

There's nothing wrong with getting an education, but don't forget that university isn't an island unto itself. I've been around and have worked several years for government and I know there are exploited workers and uncaring governments. It may come as a shock to you, but there are also gouging landlords. Maybe the 60's are gone, but those as myself who were lucky to have been part of it have maintained our idealism. As you stated, Mr. Sproule, the 70's are upon us, but don't forget that 1984 is closing in.

Richard Desjardins  
Education 2

Re: David Sproule's letter, Nov. 18 issue of Gateway.

Although your pathetic letter hardly warrants a reply, I feel an insurmountable compulsion to do so.

In your highly superfluous use of expletives, and inept attempts at rhetoric, you chastise

Kevin Gillese for his "continual prattle" on "namby-pamby far-flung escapades." You express a concern that the public will generalize from Mr. Gillese to other university students, when in fact, such a generalization would be inaccurate, as most students have a better concept of "the real world."

By inference, we are informed that you consider yourself to be experienced, unisolated, ... and extremely knowledgeable about the real world. Mr. Sproule, tell us all about the real world. Please, draw on the vast experience that you have acquired throughout your many years; show us your great insights and enlighten us all.

The fact that you fail to recognize that most of Mr. Gillese's issues are in fact real issues, and do reflect the genuine concern of many students, informs us that it's doubtful that you are in touch with the real world.

If you are under the impression that getting a good education is the only prerequisite to functioning as a "good constructive citizen," and taking an active concern in other matters is a waste of time, I would suggest that you challenge your own logic.

Getting an education is important but a rather self-oriented activity, and in itself, without extraneous concerns, renders you socially valueless.

Of yourself you say that, "we

'reactionaries' have got more important things to do than run around bleating about every matter in our society that on the surface seems unjust." Tell us Mr. Sproule, how does one ascertain whether or not something that appears unjust on the surface is truly unjust, if we don't "bleat" about it?

Perhaps you would like to have a muzzle placed on the press to suppress any signs of potential societal dissonance.

This kind of thoughtlessness, blind acceptance that you readily prescribe to is exactly that which necessitated the uprisings of the 60's that you also mock in your letter. Obviously you were not involved nor even attempted an understanding of the 60's, to dismiss them as lightly as you do.

If your letter is a true representation of you Mr. Sproule, I doubt that you are able or willing to entertain anything contrary to what you, yourself have written. Therefore, I will explicate your ridiculous standpoint in terms of only what you have written: You refer to Kevin Gillese's "prattle" about ridiculous pseudo-issues as hilarious and a waste of time. You then waste your own time by "prattling" about something that you, yourself have deemed ridiculous.

Tsk! Tsk!

Mr. Sproule, you, in writing such a letter, have exposed yourself as a parody to the content of your letter.

Unlike your opinion of Kevin Gillese's editorials, I don't think of your letter as funny. An impoverished attitude is too serious to be funny. I'm sure that most students would wince at the thought of being associated with the type of near-sighted, restricted thought that was exemplified in your letter.

But, a word of encouragement for you Mr. Sproule: Judging from the depth of your thoughts, you should never have to worry about drowning in them.

K. Meen  
Sci. IV

This letter is written in response to David Sproule's criticisms of the Gateway editor. I rarely think Kevin Gillese knows what he is talking about, he is usually ill-informed and naively

band's performance. Yet in his precluding paragraph he begs us to appreciate the "music" and not the "shows."

My point in writing these letters is to express concern over the way these musicians have been elevated to the status of demagogues, beyond reproach. It is notable that both Mr. Ralphstrom and Mr. Johnson in their respective letters to The Gateway stated emphatically that they were moved to take up the cause by their feelings of 'outrage' and 'anger.' Such emotion when coupled with blind worship smack of fanaticism; and who is more closed minded than a fanatic?

Stuart Thompson  
Commerce II

**Ed. Note:** Dear Messrs. Thompson, Bugeaud, Johnson and Ralphstrom: If you wish to continue your discussion of the Who concert and the theory behind musical appreciation, please do so in private.

## And WHO the hell cares anymore?

Roger Daltry is not the second Messiah! It seems that national value judgement is at a premium among several devoted who freaks in the Science and Engineering faculties.

Mr. Bugeaud in his letter to the Gateway of Nov. 9 suggests that he was "lucky" to see the Who in concert, in Edmonton. I refuse to see what luck was involved in such a plain business transaction as the purchase of a ticket.

The Who came here for no other reason than to make a profit and I went to see them play to their fullest ability. I simply feel that they did not in fact do so - for the reasons as stated in my previous letter.

I would further like to point out the existence of a simple inconsistency in Mr. Bugeaud's letter that undermined his credibility as one able to call me "narrow-minded." That is his reference to the "...surrealistic-fantastic..." light show as one of the presumably finer points of the

## Ross does as Romans do

This letter is in reply to an article written by Colin Ross, "U Not Ivory Tower," Nov. 2, 1976.

As a former native student in the University of Alberta, a non-native, I would like to clear up the matter of my financial situation while attending University. I did not receive in any way, shape, or form, any financial assistance from anyone. Furthermore, I not only had to support myself and pay my own fees but I also have a child to support.

It is most annoying to me to find that many people still think

that every native in Canada has all kinds of welfare and financial support, when in fact many of us have to scrounge a lot harder than anyone else. Mr. Ross should one day accompany a native woman with a child, and attending school trying to find an apartment.

I strongly object to people who continually cry, "Indian! Indian!"

As for the motto, "When in Rome do as the Romans do," Mr. Ross, where did you come from?

Margaret Cook



THE WAY  
I SEE IT

## Frank Mutton

Recent allegations by certain members of the community that Frank Mutton is other than a heterosexual have led Frank to re-examine his writing - he feels that perhaps his writing style has not fully defined his masculinity.

Next week Frank will return with his new column - BEEF.