

# Wrong, Wolfman—draft registration is heavy

Uncle Sam and Wolfman Jack are asking men born in 1962 to do something for their country — go to the post office.

They're polite enough about it. Registering with the Selective Service System is no big deal, Wolfman says. Besides, with all the privileges in this country come a few responsibilities. And if you don't want to go to the post office, that's OK. Just be prepared to face the possibility of a five-year prison term and a \$10,000 fine.

It's an ugly choice, but one a new group of University students must make this week, despite tireless efforts by groups such as the Committee Opposed to Registration and the Draft, and despite Pres.-elect Ronald Reagan's stated opposition to peace-time registration.

Whether to register is a decision best left to

each individual, but even men who choose to comply with the law should balk at its implications.

We oppose the draft and draft registration for several reasons. When Pres. Carter implemented the plan in July he said it would send a message to the Soviet Union that the United States is still a

OURS

country of action. Registering our 19- and 20-year-olds would deter Soviet military action, he said.

Obviously that "warning" went unheeded. Russian presence in Afghanistan continues, and a Soviet invasion of Poland still is considered an option by the Kremlin.

The "pool of names" argument for registration is questionable as well. At least one reputable study maintains registration saves as little as seven days in the civilian-to-soldier metamorphosis.

Underlying the arguments that registration is unnecessary now and that it is likely to lead to a draft is our belief that the draft (and therefore draft registration) is a blatant abrogation of liberty. It presupposes the bottom line of Statism: that we all owe our lives, without any choice in the matter, to the government. The notion of liberty, of freedom from slavery or imprisonment, is completely lost.

Men born in 1962 should carefully consider all their options this week, and should think twice about Wolfman Jack's television-transmitted opinion that registration "ain't nothing too heavy to deal with."

YOURS

## Opposing 'O'

In the article entitled "Story of O" printed December 8, it was stated "For all the hollering 'O' turned out to be soft core rather than hard core porn." The differentiation between soft core and hard core pornography is not what the "hollering" was about. Whether the film is more "akin" to "Charlie's Angels" than to "Deep Throat" is not the point of contention as implied by the article. It is not the degree of explicitness nor how graphic the scenes of violence, abuse or mutilation that draws my objection Mr. Manny. You miss the point. The issue is this — the existence of (in any form) violence against, abuse of and mutilation of women. More specifically, it is the belief that any film or other form of "entertainment" which depicts women as obedient, passive, willing (or unwilling, for coercion need not be overt to be effective) sexual slaves who submit to abuse serves to reinforce and perpetuate the dehumanizing, degrading and destructive attitudes typically held about women. Such attitudes result in grave consequences for women whether it be in their homes, their places of employment, or in their communities. This is evidenced, only in part, by statistics that show the ever-increasing rates of battered women, of reported rapes (not to forget the unreported rapes) and as-

saults on women.

Manny (the reporter) describes the film as "silly but well-photographed." The use of the word "silly" somehow implies that the content of the film does not merit protesting. The reduction of women to less than human beings may be described as many things but "silly" it is not! I believe it is worth my while to protest and oppose anything which denies women (or men) the right to be treated with respect and dignity. A right that each and every one of us deserves unconditionally.

Lora Pierce  
Graduate student,  
International studies

## Applauding 'O'

After reading Bill Manny's article on "The Story of O" I was appalled at all the criticism and had to respond. I saw the film several years ago when it first came out and would have seen it again if I had seen it advertised. The story is excellent and the cinematography is some of the best I've seen. There are many excellent scenes where the foreground action subtly nets background imagery (eg. beautiful gardens seen through a window between "O" and her lover talking at a restaurant).

"O" is the heroine who goes through countless scenes of savage sexualism

for the man she loves. In the end (you shouldn't always leave without seeing the entire picture), her lover becomes enraptured with her. "O" finally gets what she wants, gains control over her lover (or at least equality), and brands her lover with a cigarette lighter (in the shape of an "O").

True, a violent sexist story, but what a story; I admit I was awakened erotically (we all suppress primeval savagery), but nothing compared with my intellectual admiration of the author's so finely and intricately weaving a sensitive love story amongst blatant violence. One can be enlightened by drawing the conclusion that O's reaction to her previous savage treatment leads her also to that level of savagery when she brands her lover; a point showing that how a person is treated often leads to similar treatment from them.

"The Story of O" is a balance of sensitivity and violence so true in one form or another in human existence. I thought it was a film every mature adult should see, but apparently with guidance.

J.F. Cowgill  
Architecture

## For John Lennon

December 8, 1980 will now mark the day that John Lennon was shot and killed outside his New York apartment. Together with Paul McCartney, Ringo

Starr and George Harrison, the four men changed the history of rock and roll by greatly affecting the attitudes and style of music.

Following a long period of self-exile, Lennon was finally making his way back into the mainstream of the musical world with another album soon to be released. It is difficult to comprehend how one man, described by local police as a "kook," could have in a few seconds time ended Lennon's life.

This act of senseless violence is certainly not an isolated event. But senseless violence like this does not effect us until it happens to someone we love. On December 8, that someone was John Lennon.

Throughout the world, newspapers in different countries covering the event the following day seemed to ask the same question: "How can the United States fail to employ stricter gun control methods?" If there is a lesson to be learned from this madness, perhaps we can find it in this question.

For now, we mourn the loss of one of the greatest musical talents the world has ever known. Through the sadness, the words of George Harrison keep coming back to mind:

"Life goes on within you and without you."

Maggie Lear  
Junior, Psychology

## More zealotism

Why is it when people make political speeches and engage in debates to get their point across they are cheered, yet when someone tries to get his point across on Christianity or Christian ethics he is greeted by jeers of "Bullshit"?

May I remind Mr. Wasson that he and the Christians are in the same boat. Both Mr. Wasson and the Christians have a point to get across. However, Mr. Wasson has the advantage of a somewhat moldy column while the Christian has to resort to trying to talk to people on a one-on-one basis.

Might I suggest, also, that Mr. Wasson's "friend" was being more of a stubborn "zealot" than the Christian. While the Christian sat back and took the full salvo of Glen's anti-Christian argument, Glen refused the Christian an opening statement or even a rebuttal. I ask, "Who is being the 'zealot' now?"

The point I want to make is that when one accuses another of "zealotism" and then refuses to listen to the "zealot," he has become the thing he hates and criticizes, a close-minded "zealot." It seems that Mr. Wasson's friend, Glen (and possibly Mr. Wasson), have become the kind of hypocrites I just mentioned. It also seems that the "Christian zealot" reflected Glen's values better than Glen did. Maybe Glen should spend another decade examining his "values."

Matthew T. Ruane  
Freshman, anthropology  
Wednesday, January 7, 1981

