

## No Lambs Outside the Gates of Eden

By Mitchel Cohen

Given the fact that most 'relationships' in this society differ only in degree from those depicted in porno flicks, how can you really blame people for seeking to find on celluloid (or anywhere else) substitutes for what remains unsatisfying in their daily lives? For me, what is unusual and optimistic is the rather large number of people, womyn and men alike, who are able to transcend their socializations and recognize, as Tom Hillgardner so wisely stresses in his letter in the Nov. 14 issue of Statesman, that this "world can do with a little less lust and a lot more love."

In our society, loving human relationships have become subject to the market. We are taught to fulfill our human needs, sexual and otherwise, through mass consumption of commodities. We relate to other people, to ourselves, and to our activities through objects, which we imbue with human qualities; and at the same time, reduce people to the realm of objects, for us to manipulate, possess, and dispose of as we see fit.

Property values become

substituted for human loving ones. Possessiveness and narcissism repress and destroy the potential for freedom. Jealousy, macho arrogance, and monosexuality are some of the forms this objective situation takes when filtered through alienated minds that refuse to (or are brainwashed not to) deal with the essence — the roots of their social and sexual needs, remaining transfixed in accepting the appearance of things.

But just as most people who vote to see porno flicks reinforce the alienating and exploitative conditioning of this system, so too do some of the people who claim opposition to the film, and who, in their faratical outrage, have gone so far as to appeal to the forces of the State (in this case, the Administration and the police), to ban its showing, a point C. M. Categenova makes in his viewpoint, in the Nov. 12 issue of Statesman.

Not only are those who fail to learn from history condemned to repeat it, but it appears that, even after the fact, they are not aware they have done so. And if history repeats itself, the first

time as tragedy and the second as farce, what of the third, fourth, and fifth times?

Being against pornography should not mean being against people who want or believe they need to see a pornographic film, any more than being against fascism implies being against the person who, out of his or her repressed needs, turns to fascism as the false and unsatisfying solution to his socially-produced neurosis. Yet time and again, people who call themselves progressive fail to learn this crucial, yet simple, historical lesson unconsciously leading us into the abyss their conscious words would condemn. Why are they so blind? Why do they act with such arrogance? Do they think they can change people's desires by banning a film, or by ranting at a person? Where is their supposedly progressive understanding of how the society works in getting people to do its dirty work, in getting people to keep themselves in chains? The question should not be posed as: "how do we get this film banned?", but as "how do we begin creating a society in which people would not feel the

need to seek enjoyment or satisfaction through the exploitation of other people?" — including through pornographic films.

Those people who appeal to the State to ban a pornographic film deserve the kind of backlash they will get from the responses of people conditioned by the very state being appealed to. Fortunately, there is another much larger grouping of people who oppose the pornographic film, on the grounds that it violates their right to privacy, that it is an invitation to people to act offensively and to take part in viewing an offensive movie, in the homes of the people who are most offended by it. Although pornography is generally super-exploitative of womyn, reducing men, and the potential of human relationships between people, in this process.

Most people who oppose the pornographic film are not

interested in enforcing their moral judgments on others, or in dictating, by means of the State or Administration, a censorship on other students. We want to remove not only (or merely) a little of porno film from the world, but all exploitation and oppression, in all its insidious, and often more dangerous forms. Compared with the judicial and police apparatus of the state, a pornographic film is inconsequential. The point is, it should not have been made into a choice between getting rid of the one or the other, as some pornographic opponents, out of their own neurotic and stupid fanatical fascism have forced upon us, but both. Learn from history, damnit. Do we all have to be in the ovens again before you'll say, "aw, shucks, I blew it again, huh"?

(The writer is a member of the Red Balloon Collective.)

## No Earmarking

By Ron Serpico

This viewpoint is written in response to a letter by Clark Jablon which appeared in the Nov. 12 issue of Statesman. Jablon's letter concerned an upcoming referendum to amend the Constitution to prevent referenda which would earmark funds to a specific organization. The facts on which the letter was based are nonexistent. The misconceptions, and in some cases outright slurs against Polity officials, must be cleared up.

The reason for amending the Constitution to eliminate the specific earmarking of funds through referendum is not "to steal funding power from the students and turn it over to the undemocratic, bureaucratic, political, and often vindictive budget committee." The referendum would not "steal funding power from the students." Student funding power is constitutionally delegated to the Polity Senate, a representative body freely elected by the student population. To have a referendum put before the student body requires approximately 2,500 signatures, one-quarter of the current undergraduate population. The petitioning process itself entails a considerable amount of hard sell lobbying by the organization sponsoring the referendum. The referendum would prevent large, well-organized clubs from obtaining funds through a referendum, thereby bypassing the budgetary procedures all other campus organizations must go through. And, in the process, it would possibly obtain funds it would normally not have received if it was judged on its merit and on its benefit to the student body, relative to all other clubs.

In Jablon's letter, he refers to the Polity Budget Committee as "undemocratic, bureaucratic, political and often vindictive." Such comments are ill informed, cheap, and downright sleazy.

Jablon once again illustrates his reluctance to use facts when he states that the intramural sports program is funded by referendum. It is not. Intercollegiate sports are funded by referendum.

Jablon mentions "honest and logical reasons" for NYPIRG and Athletics to use a referendum for funding purposes. These are his reasons, and they are neither "honest" nor "logical." A. to remove funding from "Polity elites" who are ignorant of the popularity of sports. B. NYPIRG needs money for "a full time project coordinator intern program, activity costs, printing costs, phone bills, etc."

First, point A: funding is not done by "Polity elites" ignorant of the needs of clubs. It is done by a Senate committee which listens to each and every club requesting a line budget. "Polity elites" is not even worthy of comment and it reflects ignorance and naivete on the part of Jablon. Point B: all clubs have these costs; SAB Concerts, Ambulance Corps, Spectula, Statesman, just to name a few. As a result of NYPIRG's "honest and logical" referendum, their budget increased from \$5,000 in 1978-1979 to \$28,000 in 1980-1981. They are now free to pay \$7,500 of student activities fees to a project coordinator, a position not considered necessary in 1978-1979.

Funding requests for 1980-1981 totaled about \$1.2 million. Available funds are about \$755,000, of which \$91,000 is budgeted for mandatory administrative costs. The NYPIRG and Athletics referenda totaled \$129,000, or 18 percent of the available funds.

As the Polity Constitution now stands, there is no way to prevent large clubs from earmarking ridiculous amounts of money for themselves through a referendum at the expense of essential campus services.

Polity funding is limited. Campus-wide demand for funds is great. The power to obtain funds through referendum, thereby slighting the needs of other organizations and completely bypassing financial accountability and the budgeting process, should not be left to large well-organized groups.

(The writer is the Polity sophomore class representative.)

## The New Sexism

The Stony Brook campus is a massive sea of frustration. The Administration aims its policies at removing student freedoms and separating students by sex, race, and national origin so that organization of students is difficult, often impossible. The Administration uses this, the growing student fear of not finding a suitable occupation after graduation, and the sad fact of mounting student apathy as a base to enforce its increasingly rigid rules on all aspects of student life.

When student organizations form for greater social progression, greater student freedom and an end to discriminatory practices on campus, many applaud but few join. One such organization is the Womyn's Center. Until recently the Center has been commended by the majority of students for its work in the area of women's rights. The establishment of the Rape Crisis Hotline alone is a remarkable achievement for a campus that did not have a feminist organization five years ago. But there has been recent criticism on the part of men and women for the Womyn's Center. This stems from charges of discrimination against men by the Center. A Polity senator recently tried to offer his assistance and energy to the Rape Crisis Hotline and was denied the opportunity. Another person asked the Womyn's Center for assistance informing a men's organization for equality between the sexes and was allegedly told that the Womyn's Center discourages men from participation in their activities because if a man participated he would have a "subconscious tendency" to intimidate the woman involved in that particular activity and the women would have a similar tendency to be so intimidated.

Thus, there is very little doubt in my mind that the Womyn's Center has and does discriminate against men. This is a direct violation of Title IX, which bans discrimination by sex in public universities. It also violates the Center's constitution as it exists on file in the Polity Office. It is also my belief that the Womyn's Center is not representative of the majority of student women on this campus in that there is an extremely small group of radical feminists, I would even venture to call them separatists, who are in control of the Center. It is their belief that the women's movement for equality (feminism) should be kept separate, even secret from all men. Is this philosophy representative of the majority of women on this campus? Even more so, should our student activities fee fund an organization that actively discriminates against about one-half of the

undergraduate population?

Please keep in mind that I am not speaking out against the establishment of equality between the sexes, I believe in that. What I definitely do not believe in is the espousment of a new rising tide of female sexism perpetuated by the Womyn's Center.

For example, take the Irving College banning of the porno film, Debbie Does Dallas, in which the Womyn's Center played a substantive role, keeping in mind I am no avid fan of pornography or the exploitation of both sexes it depicts. A member of the Center, who is also an Irving Resident, began circulating a petition against the usage of the Irving College Main Lounge for the purpose of showing the film. In the petition there were clauses indicating that to allow the film to be shown would be an espousment of sexism and exploitation of women, but nowhere was there anything mentioning the exploitation of men that the film also would have shown. Isn't it clear that men are exploited to the same degree as women in pornography, only in a totally different manner? I take the position that most men in real life aren't as pornography depicts them, nor (as the Womyn's Center would like to make us all believe) are they potentially that way. I, too, am a resident of Irving and would have signed the petition had I said something about how pornography constantly places the men in the role of the rapist or the sadistic, lusty chauvinist. Do you think that most men identify with those roles?

Also, I have been told that at the debate on the showing of the film by the Irving Legislature a representative of the Womyn's Center called a male Irving staff member an obscenity so as not to be heard. Is this the way to establish equality? By confronting the entire male gender as exploiters of women and/or potential rapists? To this question I think any rational person would answer an emphatic "no." In fact there are quite a few men on this campus who believe in equality between the sexes but are not given the opportunity to help and are in fact turned away by the only organization on campus that is supposedly dedicated to this ideal, the Womyn's Center.

Lastly, I appeal to the people of this campus to organize a new group comprised of students of both sexes, dedicated to the establishment of equality between all men and women, and an end to the tyrannical policies of the Administration.

(The writer, an undergraduate psychology major, requested that his name be withheld.)