

# Gateway

Member of  
Canadian University Press

Published twice weekly by the  
University of Alberta Students' Union  
in the Gateway Offices, Room  
282, Students' Union Building.

Volume LXVI, Number 48  
March 23, 1976

## SENIOR EDITORS

Editor: Greg Neiman  
News: Kim St. Clair  
Features: Kevin Gilless  
Arts: Lindsay Brown  
Sports: Darrell Semenuk  
Graphics: Craig McLachlan  
Photo Editor: Bob Austin  
Footnotes: Marg Reed

## STAFF

Mike Amerongen  
Mary MacDonald  
Willie Campbell  
Beno John  
Lee Rankin  
Brian Gavriloff  
Nancy Brown  
Mary Duczynski  
"1,000 Peaks" Rankin  
Peak-a-boo Rankin  
Planetary Lander Crew  
Jim Tanner

## CIRCULATION

Circulation 18,000. The Gateway  
publishes on Tuesday and Thursday  
during the Fall and Winter Sessions.  
It is distributed to the students,  
academic, and non-academic staff  
on campus.

Subscription Rates: \$10.00 for 67  
issues

Circulation Manager: Jim Hagerty

## ADVERTISING

No mats accepted. National and local  
advertising \$.28 per agate line.  
Classified Ads, 10¢ per word. All  
classified ads must be prepaid.

Advertising Manager: Tom Wright  
432-3423

## PRODUCTION

Ad make-up, layout and typesetting  
done by Media Productions, Univer-  
sity of Alberta, Room 238, Students'  
Union Building.

Production Managers:

Loreen Lennon  
Margriet Tilroe-West

## FOOTNOTES

Publicizes campus events or those of  
interest to students, without charge.  
Footnote forms available at the  
Gateway office and should be sub-  
mitted before 2 p.m. Mondays and  
Wednesdays.

## LETTERS

Submit all letters, typed and double-  
spaced to the Editor, who reserves  
the right to edit copy. Regular copy  
deadlines apply.

Opinions expressed in the Gateway  
are those of the writer, and are not  
necessarily those of the Gateway.

## GRAPHICS

Submit all graphics, cartoons, and  
illustrations to Graphics Editor by  
normal copy deadlines.

## COPY DEADLINES

Monday noon for the Tuesday edi-  
tion; Wednesday noon for the Thurs-  
day edition.

## TELEPHONES

Editor's office:  
432-5178  
All Departments:  
432-5168  
Media Productions:  
432-3423

# Read this,- and retain your sight

Somebody out there isn't going to like this but pornography isn't the innocent little stuff that some of us thought it was. Most people greet it with a snicker and describe it as just some harmless literature that keeps dirty old men out of mischief.

In my original article (Gateway, Oct. 16), I talked about how we become so accustomed to things in life (especially if they are exposed in slow, gradual dosages), that we no longer think of them as being something unusual. Pornography is one of these. Some time ago I did some intensive research into this whole subject. I studied the Report of the Longford Committee Investigating Pornography (officially presented to the British government - House of Lords - in 1972) and the Dissenting Section of the Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography (officially presented to the American government - Congress and the President in 1970). Most quotations given are from the above Reports.

Pornography is basically concerned with sex. Specifically, the British Report defines pornography as that which, "exploits and dehumanizes sex." D. H. Lawrence, the world famous novelist, defines pornography as "doing dirt on sex." Again, from the British Report I quote, "Pornography is more likely to deposit ugly images in the consciousness or sub-consciousness of the young than it is to contribute toward the formation of a wholesome attitude toward sex."

Why such harsh statements concerning the effect of pornography on sex? Human beings are not just sex machines (put in a dime and out comes a neatly wrapped package of sex). Human beings are people and people have emotions, needs and desires; when people view and use human beings as mere objects of sexual gratification they are essentially destroying them.

You cannot separate sex from the individual - the two are as interconnected as birds and wings.

This interconnection is not merely a theory - the abuse of this relationship is a very real fact which causes much suffering and pain in the lives of thousands of people every day. Pornography tends to (1) destroy that relationship and (2) rip down sex from its noble and high position of beauty to an animalish base desire which by instinct alone must be crudely satisfied.

Let me support these statements with some significant quotations. From a well known American psychoanalyst (Dr. Shainess): "The purpose of pornography is to sexually arouse the viewer or reader in a degrading way, rather than to suggest sex in a meaningful interpersonal relationship." In the words of the British educationalist (Holbrook) "the danger of pornography is that in separating sex, in the schizoid way, from the personal and by reducing the object of sexual attention to a thing, it can undermine sexual love as a source of meaning." (The fact that pornography is designed to stimulate or arouse has been well established through extensive documentation for quite some time. The evidences cited in the British Report to this effect are overwhelming. The issue is not, does pornography arouse, but what repercussions develop from its arousal?) From the conclusion of the British Report comes a powerful statement, "...we are against pornography precisely because we are for a loving, pleasurable and satisfying sexual expression and experience as a means of enhancing the lives of men and women."

Pornography does not only seek to destroy sex and the unbreakable relationship between people and sex, but also seeks to destroy the relationship between people. Peter Grosvenor - editor of the British newspaper, Daily Ex-

press says, "The effect of such propaganda can only be to damage and depreciate the relationship between the sexes ... Given a free rein, it (pornography) could spell the beginning of the end for family life and marriage as we know it."

Look at it from another angle. We have already seen that the British Report condemns pornography for its dehumanization and lack of love. The American Report, p. 387, gives a similar condemnation: "Not only is love absent from pornography, but pornography severely hampers and destroys love in people. No truthful man, upon reading a pornographic magazine, is inspired to a greater love for his wife, a deeper respect for her wishes, a stronger desire to understand her feelings, a deeper concern for her problems and a greater devotion to her as a wife and a mother. Pornography causes men to think of women as sex machines."

I have yet to see how pornography will inspire a young man to respect women. The repercussions of pornography are obvious and proven by history. Let me give two official statements as examples of the norm - "There has not been a sex murder in the history of our department in which the killer was not an avid reader of lewd magazines." by Herbert W. Case, former Detroit Police Inspector. "I have never picked up a sex deviate who didn't have the stuff with him, either on his person, in his house, or in his car" by Staff Sergeant Andrew (Morality) Edmonton City Police Force.

The medical profession also supports these findings. For example, the New York Academy of Medicine declared some time ago that "reading salacious literature... interferes with the development of a healthy attitude and respect for the opposite sex."

Finally, pornography is wrong because it destroys the individual. Here are some

quotations: 1. "Is a pornographic picture of a woman - or a man ... likely to produce feelings of respect for the human dignity of a person in the picture or is it likely to degrade them? Very few people would like to see their wives, mothers, sisters or daughters in a pornographic picture because of the innate feeling that this kind of picture detracts from human dignity." (British Report.) 2. "Pornography is loveless, it degrades the human being, reduces him to the level of an animal." (American Report.) 3. "The effect of pornography is to turn women (and indeed men...) from human beings into objects of lust. It has a strong dehumanizing trend... the trend in dress - or rather undress - in advertising seems to have followed the tendency to make women into sexual objects rather than rational human beings." (British Report)

Probably the most significant way pornography destroys the individual is through the frustration it causes. Pornography is intended to arouse normal sexual passions. Unfortunately, instead of then satisfying these sexual passions, it merely leaves the person hanging - often at a high level of sexual excitement - but without release. What is the frustrated individual supposed to do then? Do such repeated experiences free a person into sexual freedom or do they enslave a person into sexual bondage; forcibly driving one to seek sexual satisfaction, in whatever means possible; even contrary to his will and often at the expense of innocent victims?

It is precisely because I am for sex (in its proper place) that I am against pornography. Let's leave sex in its pure original form. Sex is beautiful when it is used as God planned - in marriage for pleasure and procreation - It is man who takes God's creation and pollutes, perverts and eventually destroys it.

Peter D. Schalin

## letters

### Trial story a mockery

RE: *The Gateway*, Tues. March 9, "Mocking the Law"

The article written by Leona Elchuk about the medical mock trial was a great disappointment. No one is mocking the law at a mock trial. Indeed, the very point of a mock trial is that it affords the opportunity to present the law, in an adversary situation, that is relevant to a fictitious fact situation. The only mocking then is of the facts.

I wish to assure your writer that the law, which was correctly cited and ably argued by all counsel on the case, was the relevant law. The medical roles were well handled by medical students, who had spent some time preparing to handle their positions as "experts."

Sadly, your writer misunderstood one of the consequences of this interaction by the two professions. The law students and the medical students enjoyed themselves and the mock trial. They ex-

pressed their enjoyment by giggles as the plaintiff emphasized her injuries, by chuckles as various medical witnesses strained to remember the lecture of many months ago or the chapter read last night which would help answer the question being asked, and finally, by the laughter when legal counsel, playing their advocates' roles to the full, locked horns on an issue or "gracefully" accepted a ruling from the bench.

The law and the fun was real. The facts and *The Gateway's* report were unreal.

Ellen Jacobs  
Associate Professor  
Faculty of Law

### Ag reject

In the first place, "clique" is defined as a "narrow circle or group of persons held together by a common identity of interests, views or purposes." Is 300 people a narrow circle? The purpose of the Ag Club is to provide Agricultural students with various functions during the year (i.e. Round-Up, Christmas party, G.R.O.G., Bar None, as well as numerous exchanges and of course Friday Culture Class). We make available the opportunity to get out, have a good time and above all, meet new people. We will not hold the hands of those jam-tarts hiding

## Free Parking!

Can you believe it? In this day and age it is a rarity so I feel *EVERYONE* should be entitled to take full advantage of the situation.

Where? The courtyards of the Dentistry-Pharmacy complex. If you are concerned about the "Flammable," "Reserved Parking," "Fifteen Minute Loading Zone," "Tow Away," or even the "Paralegic Parking," *DO NOT BE AFRAID*. After all, it seems unfair that a light blue Volkswagon (LP KHC-748), an orange Fiat (LP NHC-027), a

white and orange Blazer (LP KDN-356), a blue Toyota (LP NKR-972) and several others should have exclusive free parking. Campus Security will "check into the situation" but "can not remove vehicles without the building superintendent's complaining" and does not even bother to ticket your vehicle, to save you the hassle of the Parking Appeals Committee.

Why not share with your fellow students?

G. Samaritan

in the corner and *beg* them to join in. Your own participation determines what kind of a time you have.

Those belonging to the Ag Club "clique" right now, are those that participate and help (i.e. direct and coordinate) at the functions, not those that tag along only if a friend happens to go.

The five dollar fee required to become an Ag Club member is invested into these Ag functions so that Aggies in general can get out for a good time and meet new people. Along with the membership comes discounts on rings and Ag jackets, not to mention free admission to Bar None. Were it not for the overall success of Ag functions

(most of which are open to all faculties), the Ag Club would go into debt by allowing these benefits. The five dollar fee is returned to active members many times over.

Now I think that's one hell of a good deal, and for those Aggies like "Ag Reject" that sit there and feel sorry for themselves, maybe they had better just think about what they are doing and perhaps they'll realize whom it is to blame for their lack of enjoyment. So, on behalf of Alice Chalmers and myself, get out to those Ag functions and get involved. Your enjoyment will come.

Rusty Musbacher

Ag 3  
(Formerly of Science 2)