

## People's Forum

# Radical feminist replies

Dear Editor:  
In The People's Forum of your weekend edition, was a letter from Mr. Guiseppe Gori questioning feminists, particularly radical feminists. Since I regard myself as a radical feminist, I guess I had better reply.

Mr. Gori quoted various feminists to show how bizarre is their moral code. It is always tempting to lift some statement out of context to support a point. (I have done it myself on occasion!) I do not know in what context these statements by now, Dr. May Jo Bane or Margaret Sanger were made. I do know that Margaret Sanger's work to legalize birth control brought hope to millions of poverty-stricken women who were ill and dying because they were having babies every year. I also know that feminists of every persuasion give serious consideration to the problems afflicting society, particularly women and children. They could hardly be seen to be "jumping on bandwagons." My own feminist stance has developed slowly with much agonizing and soul-searching over a number of years.

The heading of the letter read: "Feminists Questioned." What do feminists want? Here are five items on our wish-list.

1. Safety of person for all women. That means an immediate end to rape, incest, wife-beating, and sexual harassment. The vast majority of these crimes are perpetrated by heterosexual males. It means having as much access as males to travelling, walking at night in lonely places and living alone. It means being

able to return to university at night without fear of being murdered, or getting out of one's car in an underground garage without fear of being hacked to death. All these freedoms men take for granted.

2. An end to victim-blaming. That means calling "family violence", "wife-battering". It means calling abusive males to account, forcing them to take responsibility for their own violent actions, making them face the knowledge that they chose whom to attack, how to do it, and when to do it. It means handing out appropriately stiff sentences to them.

3. Giving women complete charge of their own sexuality. This means each woman gets to decide whether or not to have children, how many to have and when to have them. Her decision should be free of coercion from family, friends, state and church. That means free access to contraceptives. While many feminists do not like abortion, and deplore it as a method of birth control, they do know all about the woman-unfriendly world we inhabit, and demand medically safe abortions for women who need them.

4. The right to equal human dignity with men. This means an end to demeaning advertisement, pornography, sex-role stereotyping in media portrayal, the use of language that is male-dominated, (e.g. "mankind" instead of "humanity"), - anything that would suggest women are second-grade human material, there to be "controlled" or exploited for sex or profit in this

consumer-oriented society.

5. A more equitable distribution of power and the profits of labour between the sexes. This means that if women make up fifty percent of the world's population, perform two-thirds of the world's work, yet only receive ten percent of the world's pay and own less than one percent of the world's property, (a U.N. statistic), then they should receive two-thirds of the world's pay and own two-thirds of the property. It means that if society remains the same as it is now, women should make up fifty percent of personnel in senior management, corporate business and government. They should have as much political and economic clout as males.

Since our society right now, condons the abuse of women, most feminists are strong advocates of social change. They know that the kind of world they want for women cannot come about within the "traditional" framework. So, yes, feminists are a radical lot, if "radical" is taken in its true sense, meaning "rooted". Right now they're busy critiquing every human institution, getting to the roots, if you will, of age-old, unjust, patriarchal structures that really could bring about the end of our species, if left to run on unexamined and unchecked. More power to them!

Yours sincerely,  
Joan Davison.

\*Patriarchy - rule of the fathers. This is the word used by feminists to indicate the pervasiveness of male dominance.

## Finance rebuttal

The Editor:

I have only just seen Mr. P.C. Masson's spirited defence of Rockel's contentious Rule of 72. I was not quibbling with decimal accuracy and the payment of interest annually, monthly, daily or hourly does not change the elegance of the lemma used in the original letter.

Let's use an example which caught my eye in scanning papers following a short holiday.

The doughty Justice Sopinka listed his Oakville house for \$990,000, but would now settle for \$750,000, since house values have deteriorated. He paid \$39,500 for the dwelling in 1965. He must live in Ottawa since his 1988 appointment and needs to be recompensed for the establishment languishing on a soft market.

How realistic is he in expecting the public to pay the interest associated with either his asking or settling price?

There is nothing in the interest tables by any of the authorities quoted by Mr. Masson to come to any conclusion on this issue. The lemma handles it beautifully. Here's how:

A	B	B/A	Term	log e	Interest
Original	Final	Ratio	Yrs.	Ratio	Rate/Yr.
39500	995000	25.2	23	3.227	14.0%
39500	750000	19.0	23	2.944	12.8%

The public can reasonably decide that the good Justice is asking plausible interest rates, and not be distressed that this is another rip-off. The number also suggests the interest penalty paid for just slightly higher interest rates on our public debt, a mere \$380 billion.

My financial acquaintances know a rule of 70, to double money, but Dr. Bogen is an unfamiliar authority. The Rule of 72 which comes to mind to these people is the D day, in 1972, for evaluating stocks to pay capital gains tax.

Since the death penalty was abandoned for usurers, covens of witch doctors have offered arcane advice on how to get rich without benefit of much logic or thinking. We prefer people to think and use good universal tools to manage information effectively. The lemma is logical, elegant and universal.

Thanks to the opportunity to rebut.

Yours very truly,  
Bill Hyde,  
Halton Hills.

## Write us a letter!

The Herald wants to hear from you. If you have an opinion you want to express or a comment to make, send us a letter or drop by the office. Our address is 45 Guelph Street, Georgetown, Ontario L7G 3Z6.

All letters must be signed. Please include your address and telephone number for verification.

The Herald reserves the right to edit letters due to space limitations.

## Opinion

# Welcome progress appears in GATT talks

OTTAWA - While the world is preoccupied with war, welcome progress seems to be occurring on another major issue that has divided nations.

Just over a month ago, alarmism was rampant over the future of world trade. A deep-rooted dispute between the United States and the European Community (EC) over agricultural subsidies appeared to have wrecked reform of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

"Trade War Looms!" headlines shouted, as talks in Brussels came apart. But today, there's a glimmer of hope again for GATT, the referee that oversees about \$3.5 trillion of world trade each year.

Another chance for the Uruguay Round of GATT talks is good news for Canada, which

depends more heavily upon trade than most other countries. It's also a positive development for the world economy.

Recession in North America has been spreading, threatening to bring the economic temple crashing down on the rest of the world. A combination of recession and protectionism, as countries raise barriers to foreign products, could be disastrous.

It's too soon to be complacent. Protection of the subsidies that support 10 million European farmers retails broad appeal among the political leaders of Western Europe.

But a recent visit by EC vice-president Frans Andriessen to the U.S. and Canada suggests Europe may be prepared to place a better offer on the table. Although details are sketchy so far, the EC executive commission has approved radical farm

Ottawa  
Bureau

by  
Vic Parsons  
Thomson News  
Service



reform that could mean cuts in European dairy quotas, and beef and grain prices.

**BREAKTHROUGH POSSIBLE**  
U.S. Agriculture Secretary Clayton Yeutter, the key person to be convinced, has said the EC seems serious about reform, and that GATT could be on the verge of a "major breakthrough."

Canada and other exporters of

farm produce, such as Australia, New Zealand and Argentina, are also pleased with the softening of the EC position. Trade Minister John Crosbie believes a changed attitude on the part of the Europeans could lead to settlement but cautions that hard work lies ahead.

Crosbie, incidentally, deserves a good deal of credit for Canada's creative role in this GATT round. Much of the work was "technical and unglamorous," the private sector North-South Institute said in its latest review, but Canada contributed substantially to the drafting of texts and the building of bridges between the industrial and developing countries.

Not all members of the 12-country EC have taken the hard line on subsidies represented by Germany and France. Others, including Britain, do not wish to see the process on many other issues

lost because of inflexibility on agricultural trade.

### GERMAN CRITIC

There has also been internal criticism of the EC position. Hans Peter Stihl, president of Germany's National Association of Chambers of Commerce, argued in mid-January that the EC and German position had "obstructed world trade."

Germany, Stihl added, should be aiming at a successful GATT round. Farmers would be better helped by direct income grants rather than subsidies for storage of production surpluses. This stance is similar to that argued by several Canadian experts who have surveyed the domestic farm scene.

If the dispute continues to block agreement, the world trade environment will suffer. Conversely, a breakthrough promises a new era.

# Border inspectors facing ever-increasing violence

OTTAWA - On a bad night, after the shadows melt into darkness around his border crossing, Jacques Lemay will lock the door to his customs booth and recall his night of terror.

Two shots, fired from the edge of the forest surrounding the isolated Herdman, Que., crossing, struck the glass of the booth that night and sent the veteran customs inspector diving for cover.

"I was lying on the floor. I was like a cat or a dog sitting in the corner shaking. I didn't know what would happen. It's a feeling you never forget."

It's a feeling that is infecting more officers who find themselves working alone on night shifts at remote, incident-prone crossings. On several occasions, after reporting for work

and thumbing through the "lookout" lists that warn of dangerous people in the area, Lemay has abandoned his post out of raw fear. More customs officers are following him.

"We get phone calls: 'Don't stand in the window because we'll put a bullet in your eye!' I've seen incidents so serious the army should have been there," he said.

### WALKED AWAY

Lemay walked away from his booth at the height of the crisis in nearby Kahnawake and Oka last summer after learning two Americans were coming through his crossing in a car loaded with weapons and ammunition.

Arms smuggling and the warning notices at the half-dozen remote crossings in the district had increased. Police had pulled



Ottawa  
Bureau

by  
Rennie  
MacKenzie  
Thomson News  
Service

out of the area to reinforce positions around the three Mohawk reserves in the region after armed natives set up barricades near Oka and Kahnawake. A sympathetic U.S. border guard gave Lemay a bulletproof vest, but he was denied permission to wear it.

In an ensuing dispute that involved Revenue Canada and Labor Canada, a public service adjudicator dismissed Lemay's claim that his life was in danger that night. But the adjudicator supported recommendations that inspectors work in pairs on night shifts and that they be provided with bulletproof vests and adequate police protection.

The final ruling of the Public Service Staff Relations Board recognized the dangers that can arise at remote ports. And even when inspectors work in pairs and can communicate with another crossing, they should be able to count on a quick police response whenever the need arises, says the board's final report.

Lemay says the U.S. customs

service has identified his stretch of the Quebec border as a major problem area. But there have been reports of violence at various crossings spread along thousands of kilometres of border. Shotgun blasts have shattered windows on a tour bus at Cornwall, Ont. Inspectors have been assaulted in New Brunswick, and stabbed, shot at and dodged firebombs in southwestern Ontario.

The department has introduced a post-trauma counselling service for inspectors considered victims of violence. Mansel Legacy, national president of the Customs Excise Union, said it is similar to services provided to police officers. And, while he welcomes the concession, he wants more.