

I would also encourage those with ability to begin to try and do something to correct the economic situation which pressures young people into this kind of employment.

Sincerely,
Fr. Joe Hattie, O.M.I.
Roman Catholic Chaplain.

Dal's image needs a bit less sexism

Dear Editor:

At a time when our educational system here at Dal should be polishing its best possible image to justify its standards and therefore its government funding, it seems a ridiculous paradox that the student government deems it necessary to ask the student body if it should allow stripping in our S.U.B. Even the wording is spineless. "Should we allow stripping in the S.U.B." Great. Even if 100% vote NO there's nothing from stopping a person from removing their clothing (stripping) in private and doing their thing on stage. (Don't laugh unless you've seen "Not a Love Story" or have been to New York or Copenhagen.)

I find it revolting that some here at Dal find it entertaining to strip female dignity to the level of a sexual object. With many women here at Dal afraid to walk to their dorm at night or even study alone in far away corners of Dal or the library for fear of rape, what right have we to do anything which could possibly aggravate the situation? This referendum is not an opinion poll but it is binding on the student council until another counters its ruling. I suggest some sombre thinking before making a decision which reflects our values for each other as basic human beings. If our thoughts here at university set the standards of tomorrow's society where our children will

find their values, I for one hope we hand them something positive.

D. Duchesne
part-time student

We stand humbly corrected

To the Editor:

I would like to clarify two areas from the interview with me reported in the March 4 issue of the *Gazette*, "Gallery suffers from lack of awareness."

First of all the comparison of the Dalhousie Art Gallery with the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, as avant-garde versus conservative, is taken out of context and is therefore misleading. The fundamental difference between the two galleries is one of mandate. The Art Gallery of Nova Scotia is a provincial gallery with an expressed and primary (although not exclusive) interest in the art of the province now and in the past. The Dalhousie Art Gallery, on the other hand, does not have comparative restrictions. Its situation in and its support by a university allows the gallery to operate with a broader mandate to exhibit art of national and international origin as well as of local significance and to apply a more scholarly approach to its programmes. That the contemporary work exhibited at the Dalhousie Art Gallery is less conservative than what is shown at the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia is a subjective remark and, in this context, an irrelevant comparison.

Secondly, your reference to the gallery's annual attendance figure of 1,000 people/year is wrong. You meant to say 1,000/month or 12,000/year.

Linda Milrod
Director
Dalhousie Art Gallery

To the Editor:

Re the "Taking it to the voters" article (March 4). Why is Paula Ardetti, the Chief Electoral Officer, trying to increase voter turnout in the student union elections from 20 percent to 70 percent? This "more is better" philosophy belongs in the ranks of the Moral Majority, not student government.

Ardetti's "novel approach" of taking the polls into the classroom is diminishing the importance of the act of voting, and ultimately, of individual choice. If the election organizers adopt the attitude "Apathy or no apathy --you're going to vote!", students who have not given much thought to the election because they did not intend to vote will have to rely on the eeny-meeny-miny-mo method in order to mark their X. Thus, a small percentage of conscientious votes is being substituted for a larger percentage of coerced votes and the president of the student union will be elected by haphazard guess rather than thoughtful choice. Dalhousie students are unwittingly becoming victims of this war against electorate apathy. And they couldn't care less.

Kathryn Morse

Student council irresponsible

To the Editor:

An interesting dimension of the upcoming referendum on stripping is the wording to be included on the ballot. I had proposed the following format to the Student Council on Sunday, March 7th: "Should entertainment involving striptease and/or nudity be permitted on Student Union facilities?" This wording was soundly defeated in favour of the following proposal: "Should stripping be allowed in the Student Union Building?"

An obvious extrapolation from the difference in wording between the two proposals is that only a stripping act **per se** is being dealt with in this referendum and not the issue of nudity itself. Consequently, it is

possible that, even if the students indicate in their voting that they do not feel stripping in the SUB is acceptable, nudity, which is not mentioned in the wording of the referendum, is still fair game. So, a nude show could still occur in the SUB as long as no clothes were removed in public.

The issue that should be considered in this referendum is clearly being side-stepped. Taking off one's clothes is not intrinsically bad. What is bad is the objectification of human beings which results from public nudity. Both the people on stage and the people in the audience become objects to one another through the nudity. The human body, a very beautiful creation, therefore becomes the instrument by which human beings are degraded.

In addition to these factors, there is another dimension which we at Dalhousie must bear in mind... What will the outside community think of us if we continue to act so irresponsibly? In an era when government higher education cutbacks are the norm and tuition increases concomitantly 10-20% per annum, why should we expect to receive more subsidies when this kind of activity indicates that we abuse our privileges. Let us always remember, particularly during the upcoming referendum on stripping, that we cannot have privileges without the corresponding responsibilities.

Sincerely, Rick McCallum

Nuclear blackmail

To the Editor:

In a letter last week, I argued that the workshops on nuclear war have as their aim to create pacifist illusions on the origin of war, the character of the imperialist superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union, their domination and hegemony of the world and preparations for a third world war, and the role of the Canadian state which is beefing up the military while

slashing social funds.

The proceedings of these workshops are organized on the pretext that they are "informational sessions". But what "information" is actually provided? A particular kind of information is given. Last Saturday's topic was "Is Arms Control a Hoax?" But no "information", or "argument" of a panelist was provided from this correct view. Instead, a falsified version was attributed (a "devil's theory") to them and this was attacked by all the panelists, representative of the U.S. Congress and the Canadian government and the peaceniks alike.

The superpowers, mass media and others stress the horrors of nuclear war in order to promote fatalism and intimidate people, and create a psychosis that they are incapable of preventing such a war. They are using nuclear blackmail to lead attention away from the danger posed by conventional weapons and troops of the aggressive NATO, NORAD and Warsaw blocs, to accept these as the least evil which can be tolerated under these circumstances. This would mean that people must live under the umbrella of one or the other superpower or submit to a "peace" and "detente" between them in which they jointly lord it over the world's people.

We see these double tactics of the "carrot and stick" policy of USA and the Soviet Union not only in the proceedings and reactionary theories being promoted in the name of "information" but also in the coalition of its sponsors.

Thus we have an incredibly holy alliance of highly-paid professors of "strategic studies" financed by the Department of National Defence and connected directly with the U.S. State Department, and the Voice of Women and Ecology Action Centre, who publicly take credit for initiating the workshops - with speakers from the military, the U.S. Congress, and Project Ploughshares, who endorse Trudeau's "Strategy of

Canada needs more military strength for NATO

by Nancy Alford

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in 1949, largely as the brainchild of Lester B. Pearson of Canada. For the first 20 years Canada was a very important military presence in NATO. Canada supplied NATO with a full brigade that was admitted to be unequalled and the most powerful of all within the alliance. In the 1960's Canada's formation consisted of a 52-ship navy and 12 squadrons of fighters that were the core of Western Europe's air defense.

Since the creation of NATO Canada was the only member that was neither protecting its own soil nor running in the race of the superpowers. Thus Canada's commitment to the defense of Western Europe and contribution to NATO has always had a tremendous symbolic significance.

In the 1970's Canada's contri-

bution to NATO began to decrease. The brigade was cut in half and is now assigned only to reinforcement functions. The decrepid CF-104s of the 1950s are now only good for reconnaissance flights and the remainder of the 52 naval ships only have a few years of use left.

In the NATO alliance, Canada has the lowest military budget, surpassed only by the small country of Luxembourg. Canada is not pulling its weight in the alliance. NATO was created along the assumption of an equal alliance and strength in numbers. If Canada does not start to pull its weight it could have a negative effect on the NATO factor.

On the other side of NATO is the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. NATO is the only alliance (power) that has held the Soviets off. Without NATO the Warsaw Pact would be a threat against each country

individually. Thus the European countries would be left practically defenseless against the Warsaw Pact and could easily be taken over if a war was to start. NATO is important for the protection of Europe. This is one of the main reasons why NATO was formed. Now, in 1982, NATO has, without any doubt, lost its military supremacy over the Soviet block.

Canada's recent position in NATO has been very disappointing to the other NATO countries, but current trends are now slowly being reversed and Canada is once again starting to fulfill its position in NATO. This will be a long and slow process, but hopefully Canada will get back on its feet again, and live up to its past reputation. The outlook is more optimistic now.

In the past year and a half the Canadian defense budget has increased significantly and by the year 1985 the defense

expenditures are expected to reach \$9.8 billion - nearly double the current level.

The Canadian government is planning to purchase some new equipment, including F-18 jets and Leopard tanks, in an attempt to return some meaning to Canada's NATO commitment.

Within NATO there is the Standing Naval Force Atlantic which includes the following NATO countries: Canada, the United States, Germany, Britain, Norway and Portugal. The SNFA travels the North Atlantic and is somewhat a flag-waving show. Canada has always had a ship in the SNFA and will continue to do so.

In the two major headquarters of NATO, Brussels and Norfolk, Virginia, Canada is well represented and takes an active role. In this capacity Canada is still very committed to NATO.

As to the future importance of Canada in NATO, Canada is a

major supplier of raw goods to Western Europe. If a war breaks out in Western Europe (which will most likely be the war zone for a World War III) the major problem will be resupplying Europe. Canada and the United States will have to supply all of the raw goods and materials necessary for the subsistence of Europe. 1600 supply ships will be venturing across the Atlantic per month trying to carry out this task. Canada and the United States are supposed to be able to resupply Europe within 30 days if there is a war. This is Canada's biggest standing commitment to NATO. But without a proper navy, consisting of many more ships than now exist, Canada will not be able to prorate in this very important and valuable role. If this was to happen NATO could fall apart during a time when it would be needed the most.