

# VIEWPOINT

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1964

PAGE FIVE

## Overheard—Answered

To The Editor:

In reply to the Overheard column in the Oct. 27 Gateway, I would like to explain my remarks in Students' Council on the competence of students to handle their own affairs. Competence in the context of student government, involves an ability to make policy decisions for the ultimate benefit of the student body at large. However, competence is not possible without a responsible attitude taken by the elected student representative. In my view, this responsibility involves a vital interest in the welfare of students and the corresponding work necessary to be fully informed on controversial issues.

Our Students' Council has fallen down a number of times this year, in maintaining this responsible attitude. In the financial areas, approximately 40 per cent of the available funds were spent before budget preparation. While some expenditures were necessary, the excessive spending that resulted made necessary the arbitrary cuts from the Students' Union Budget on Oct. 19.

Thus while we have a fine tradition of responsible student government on this campus, this tradition cannot guarantee performance for this or coming years.

Yours very truly,

Richard Price,  
Secretary-Treasurer,  
The Students' Union

## Letter to Davy

Dear Professor Davy:

You are my hero, because not too long ago you were the chairman of a panel on a radio programme which pointed out that women were not as intelligent as men and should therefore stop all the competing that some of them try to do. Well, Dr. Davy, I'm looking to you to suggest some action we could take regarding the woman who just won the Nobel Prize in chemistry. What do you think would be suitable under these circumstances? Do you suppose a letter of protest to the Nobel Committee reminding them that women aren't supposed to compete with men is a good idea? Or perhaps we might pull her (the woman who won the prize) into line by pointing out that from now on no men are going to light her cigarettes!!!

WORRIED  
science 1

## Correction

To The Editor:

I am sorry that Mr. Blake was distressed by the report in The Gateway of Oct. 23 in which I was quoted. His distress was shared by many including myself. It goes, I hope, without saying that the report was incomplete. I was asked to comment on remarks made by the chaplain of Carleton University on the subject of pre-marital sexual relations as these remarks had been reported in The Gateway during the previous week. According to the headline Mr. Paul of Carleton was said to have condoned pre-marital sexual intercourse. To anyone familiar with the problems of expounding the Christian point of view on this subject in a university setting, it is quite clear that Mr. Paul was misrepresented. I attempted to point out to The Gateway reporter this possible misrepresentation.

I did, however, make it quite clear that, if the report on Mr. Paul's remarks was correct, I disagreed with them. I do not believe pre-marital sexual intercourse can be justified within the Christian frame of reference, and this I continually point out to students. However, I also made the point (and I think it is an important one) that the degree of guilt attaching to such relationships varies enormously according to circumstances. It is clearly not nearly as bad to engage in pre-marital sexual intercourse when two people are committed by engagement and close personal devotion (especially if marriage is prevented temporarily for economic or other reasons) as it is to fornicate promiscuously with a wide variety of partners in a series of casual encounters. The difference in guilt is significant: in the first case there is a high degree of personal commitment; in the second this personal commitment is wholly lacking and people (made in the "image of God") are used as things. It was this important subsidiary point that was reported in The Gateway article; without my first statement that I disapproved Mr. Paul's remarks as quoted, the report made it seem that I would condone pre-marital sexual intercourse between engaged persons. This is not the case.

Yours faithfully,  
Brian Heenev,  
Anglican Chaplain

## Balanced Judgment?

To The Editor:

We, as university students, must all be very thankful for the

Nothing succeeds like sex, in creating a controversy that is, as Viewpoint writers prove. There are also those who would feed the Christians to the lions.

opportunity we have to develop sensible and open-minded attitudes. During the years in which I have thrived in this stimulating atmosphere, I have been increasingly impressed by the apparent success of the university environment in achieving such qualities of balanced and enlightened judgment in its students. Most often this success is mirrored in the letters which your equally stimulating paper receives.

Such an illustration appeared in the Oct. 30 issue, in which a sadly-maligned victim of VCF-craft-and-cunning gave vent to his feelings in appropriate and well-thought-out phrases. Regardless of the particular circumstances surrounding his "beef," I was most impressed by the explicit and relevant way in which he expressed himself. Why, indeed, must we be subjected to "obese, sow-like girls" when availing ourselves of the volunteer service offered by the VCF? Cannot the Christians recruit anyone of more attractive appearance to represent their faith?

Perhaps GR should toy further with his idea of a "Students' Agnostic Bookstore." Such an endeavor could be staffed with honest, agnostic businessmen (of which there are so many) rather than those "scary" Christian ones.

Perhaps the greater part of the tension prevalent in our society is due to scary Christian businessmen in stalls.

But I digress. Thanks for your letter, GR; it has maintained my assurance that mature, responsible minds are developing on our campus and in our faculty.

Gerry Manning  
arts 4

P.S.—While I am neither connected with the VCF nor a victim of its business practice, I hate to see a good letter like GR's go unsupported.

## Sex Criticism Juvenile

To The Editor:

I found Mr. Blake's criticism of the replies on pre-marital sex by Chaplains Anderson, Keil and Heenev to exhibit a high degree of juvenility which is often the case with fundamentalists and Sunday School dogmatists.

I find it rather interesting that Mr. Blake thinks that Rabbi Ginsburg and Father Pendergast both take a stand which is consistent with the Christian position. I did not realize that Judaism was consistent with Christianity nor that Roman Catholicism was again the universal voice of the Christian position. Furthermore I would like to know what Mr. Blake means when he so loosely uses the phrase "clear voice of Christianity." Is he by chance referring to voices from clouds and hands writing on walls?

Being a Christian myself and

hence, basing my faith on the teachings of Christ as recorded in the New Testament, I cannot find any direct reference to pre-marital sex which can be considered intelligently as being "clear cut." Christ did not build His church on rules and regulations such as found in the Old Testament for in His time such an institution already existed. His mission was to reveal God's unconditional Love for His created mankind. The love commandment was the only commandment Christ issued and it was on this commandment that Christian man acts. His understanding of all the writings in the New and Old Testament is nil if he misses this commandment.

If we consider Christian love and its responsibilities in all our actions then when it comes to pre-marital sex our decision must be based on the situation.

Let's face it, the world is not sugar and spice and no clear, cut, rigid system is going to make it so.

Yours truly  
Edward Devoij  
science 3

## Reader Defends Gateway

To The Editor:

As an avid reader of The Gateway I always read every section with interest but in your Oct. 27 issue I read something that I just had to comment on.

When I read the letter "Disgusted" sent in by the Sixth Floor Girls of Lister Hall C, I didn't know whether to laugh at their naivety, cry at their ignorance, or get mad at their stupidity. Honestly!

They claim The Gateway, Student's Council and "paintbrush-happy children" can't express their opinions about or criticize residence living and the things connected with it—well I can! Because I happen to live in their "utopian" residence.

To start at the beginning of their letter so as not to miss any vital points, here goes:—

1. I am sure The Gateway would not publish any unfounded criticisms—besides which, have any of those girls ever thought that most of the criticisms are sent in by someone either in residence or connected in some indirect way with it?

2. since The Gateway is a publication that could initiate responsible and thought-provoking action, it is a good way for us insignificant people to express our grievances—or do they suggest we go through parliament or publish leaflets and drop them by plane on campus? The Gateway, with its popularity is the best and surest way of making a little known grievance realized.

3. with their comment about

The Gateway's "chronic addiction to Sex Articles" it is quite clear that Sixth Floor is populated by girls who either didn't attend Dr. Vant's lectures or slept through them (or was it that they just didn't understand anything)—if by the time you get to university you can't read an article about sex and discuss it openly I'm afraid something should be done about it—maybe a new course can be offered on campus:

"An Introduction to the Differences between Males and Females" or "Elements of the Facts of Life" or maybe still "A Complete Coverage of the Functions of the Birds and Bees."

4. if they want something more constructive (and maybe intellectual?) than what The Gateway is presently publishing I would like to suggest to them that Cameron Library is open Mon. to Fri. 2 a.m. to 10 p.m. but I am sorry to say that I don't think the encyclopedias can be taken out (but they could always find out for sure—maybe with special permission . . . Oh, Sat., they could also run down to fill their minds but only till 12:30 p.m.

5. I am not going to say anything about Mr. Tauzer because I feel he is doing his job and there are more people involved and restrictions laid down by other people in this matter than anyone knows about . . .

6. for people who are unfamiliar with correct campus dress and campus activity I would suggest they open their eyes when they are on campus and try and read some of the many posters found in every corner of campus—that is of course if they really don't like to get acquainted with other people on this campus.

7. their insinuation that The Gateway would not publish their letter is just another sign of their narrow-mindedness—

I am wondering what these girls were like in high school. Did their mothers tell them what to wear? Did their principals or teachers personally tell them what was going on in the school? And if so—"WHERE DID THEY GO TO SCHOOL?" Did the girls of Sixth ever send their laundry to Lister? Do the girls of Sixth eat all the meals in Lister? Do the girls of Sixth realize there are nine other floors in residence besides their own?

O well, who knows, maybe next year!

I am sure that if these girls ever grow up enough to reach the rest of university age level, they'll realize how pathetic their letter was.

A Third Floor Girl  
Lister Hall C  
arts 2

P.S.—I am sure The Gateway will publish this letter because I know they are not afraid to let other people's opinions be known . . .

