

Ladies object

We, the Ladies of McLeod House, wish to express our outrage re: the "Armchair Quarterback" article written by John Geary that appeared in the February 3rd issue of the Brunswickan.

Not only is this article offensive and degrading for females, it is downright disgusting. It certainly displays a lack of maturity on the part of the author.

On behalf of all females, we demand an apology!

Leanne Cooper
 Heather Guilmore
 Leanne King
 Lisa Simpson
 Tanya Robertson
 Carolyn Subman
 Dana Mink
 Chris Rose
 Margaret Brown
~~Michelle Kupper~~
 Dana Mink
 Jennifer Hart
 Josephine Hickey
 Kathryn Giles
 Marceline Vautour
 Heather Reid
 Jill Bowen
 Chris Leduc
 Alison Spalding
 S. Yee
 Barbara Boone
 Sandra Lapointe
 Lea Buis
 Evelyn Symons
 Suzanne Lewis
 Joanne Gray
 Dawn Jope
~~Michelle Kupper~~
 Jameson Lake
 Michelle Kupper
 Janet Allaby
 Myra Green
 Janet Nichols
 Holly Newman
 Jennifer George
 Patricia Skidmore

Shelley Matthews
 Leigh Holmestis
 Lisa Phillips
 B. McNamee
 J. Roy
 Cindy Stewart
 P. Standing
 Aislinn Paul
 Brenda Hurler
 Susan Harrington
 Monica Landry
 Susan Taylor
 Debbie Whitehead
 Kim Burton
 Carrie Hickey
 Denise Nelson
 Pam Breen
 Ellen Armour
 Chantal Savine
 Kathy LeBlanc
 Candace Cherry
 Heather Newman

Josephine Leclerc
 Kaitie Lee Casey
 Kelly Connolly
 Mary Beuvick
 Michelle Swaggy
 Allison Peavie
 Karen Schlasser
 Jacob Wyzalob
 Bob Graydon
 Valerie M. Wood

Hey kids, all is well in Sugarloaf, U.S.A. Our rainy weekend was fog in Sugarloaf and a massive dump Sunday closed the mountain, preventing the UNB Ski Club from returning on schedule. Needless to say all 52 runs are open, including the snow fields. Please take note that final payments are required Friday, February 10 (today). Danny, Tim and I will be in the Social Club, at the usual time, from noon to 1:15 and all day Friday. Posted, at the Club, is a list of all travel arrangements and Condominium groupings. If your phone number is absent from the list, please add it. Our "FINAL MEETING/PARTY", is Saturday night, February 18. Attendance is mandatory for all persons on the trip. Departure times and packing arrangements must be coordinated. The drawing for the "Party Pack" raffle will also take place. We'll see you all on Saturday night, 7:00 p.m.

Ski to Die
 Gizz

The result of the First Annual Engineering vs. Business hockey game was Engineering 7 - Business 4.

I had hoped that since it was an official Business Week Activity that Mr. Sparling might at least put the score in the BRUNS. After the game he had lots of time to write. (Maybe he took this time to write the cheque for \$100.00 to the Third Century Fund.)

For those who missed it, it was a hard hitting and fast skating game with more door prizes than fans. (Paul - we even had more engineering fans.) The Engineers lead 2-0 after the first, 3-1 after the second, and at one point in the third 7-2 before Chris White rallied for two more to give the final result. Chris was the high scorer of the game with all Business goals while the Engineers spread the goals out in an even attack.

In closing, I would once more like to impress upon Paul Sparling to at least THINK before he embarrasses himself again.

Ian Morgan
 E.U.S. Council

P.S. For any other team interested in playing the Engineering Team, we're ready when you are.

ARMCHAIR QUARTERBACK



Last week's column was supposed to have been my last of the year, but a situation has developed which I feel I should address.

The situation I'm referring to is the controversy surrounding "Reason No. 6" in the "TEN REASONS WHY MONDAY NIGHT FOOTBALL IS BETTER THAN SEX" (see last week's column). Apparently there are a number of females around the campus who found it offensive, at least that's the word I've received via the grapevine. Before I go any further, I want to stress the fact that NO editorial pressure has been put on me to write this; neither am I succumbing to any peer pressure - I am not the kind of person to carry out tasks simply because of social disapproval. I do not feel any obligation to write this; I am doing it because I want to do it. It is NOT a rationalization or a justification; rather it is an explanation, and perhaps an enlightening one, to some people. I AM writing this out of humanistic considerations - I stress "humanistic", because I feel this goes beyond the bounds of gender.

I printed the article for strictly humorous reason, and a number of people did find it amusing - even some females. Believe it or not, ladies there ARE members of the fairer sex who have read it, and found it funny; that is their prerogative, and to attach the labels of "right" or "wrong" to such a choice is not only egocentric, it also means nothing. A number of female friends of mine had seen it, and were not offended, nor did they feel degraded. I was aware of this before I submitted it for publication. I certainly was not trying to degrade anyone; if anyone was being made fun of, it was the people (like myself) who are T.V. football fanatics. Anybody who really knows me, knows I am not a male chauvinist pig, nor a person who is insensitive to some of the double standards which are applied to women in our society. On reflection, I see that I have probably come across to a lot of people as that type of person; if so, I see that that is MY problem. To quote L.A. Rams head coach, John Robinson, "You live with what you do." If anyone felt offended or degraded by Reason No. 6, unfortunately, you misinterpreted it; if you still feel that way, all I can say is this: what you feel is what you feel - I'm not responsible for your feelings - how you feel is YOUR problem. If something like No. 6 in my column makes you feel degraded, then you have a problem that is beyond the scope of this column to deal with.

It is unfortunate that "No. 6" was censored the way it was; it should have been fully censored, OR left alone. As it happened, the censorship only served to draw attention to it, and perhaps influence people's thoughts regarding the statement, due to the language used in the censorship.

The incident which prompted me to write this apology was a simple, low-keyed discussion I had with a female acquaintance of mine last Friday. She simply informed me, in a mature, rational manner, that she was slightly bothered by "No. 6". No big deal, nothing reactionary on her part. I told her I had some lady friends who had seen it and had not found it offensive in nature, as far as the subject matter was concerned. She pointed out that that was fine, different strokes for different folks. She didn't fall into that category, but she accepted the fact that others did, without labelling them as "weird" or "different", or any other derogatory term. She did point out that putting it in print was the real crime; i.e., it was one thing to write about it, another thing to publish it. I had to concede on that point; however, we do have freedom of the press in this society, and I've seen published material which, from my perspective, is much more tasteless than what I wrote. Anyway, with all of what I've written in mind, I offer a sincere apology to any person who felt offended by "Reason No. 6" in last week's column; and for those of you who weren't, I hope you had a good laugh - that's what the whole thing was about in the first place.

This is a rather intellectual way to finish off a football predictions column for the year, so, Bill and Mike, if you'll allow just this one more liberty...

GO GET 'EM GASTINEAU! JETS IN '84!!!