

personal opinion?

We students have the right to a non-threatening academic environment.

In the professional field of teaching, working together as a team is a vital component. This should go without saying. If the various faculties wish to have the respect of the student body then this element of working as a team must be present.

Is Professor Vaughn Jelliffe's subjective perspective to be allowed to hinder our quality of teaching?

Signed; A student concerned about our future,
Rose Wolf

Dear editor and students

It's no wonder the "Campus Women" column of March 19 was unsigned. Both the style and the research are so inept that as a former staff member of the student publication on the same campus, I'm astonished it was even submitted.

Long ago, your campus was my home away from home for four years; the faculty and students were my surrogate family.

At that time there was only a handful of women students. We participated with the male students on an equal footing in a wide range of activities. They were not our enemies. They were more like brothers (just as aggravating, and just as lovable).

There were no student loans and bursaries then so we co-eds knew how precious was our opportunity to attend university and we were determined to learn and to achieve. We did both with distinction, setting high academic standards and friendship in the process. We did it on our own merits without compromising our integrity as women.

Surely today's women students are as capable as we were. Surely they can see through the nonsense in such resources as Vaughn Jelliffe's "report" on those "dangerous Right Wing Women", written in 1986 for the PEI Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

It reads like an inferior version of Karen Dubinsky's paper, adapted to PEI with blatant disregard for the facts. While Dubinsky's was wrong, it was very well written. But Jelliffe's version is one of the wildest

pieces of distorted fantasy I've ever come across. Supposedly a warning about the danger to Island life posed by right wing women in general (a term used by feminists to refer scornfully to any woman who doesn't agree with them), it zeroed in on only one group: Realwomen.

What made her paper particularly ludicrous was that there was no Realwomen chapter on PEI at the time. As far as Jelliffe and the Advisory Council knew, the only RW member in the province was Dianne Porter, the Chairperson of the Council, who (after signing a statement saying she shared all our beliefs) had joined Realwomen to obtain out literature and mailings. (She didn't have a membership list, but I did, and she toned down her attacks considerably when I threatened to expose her in the local papers.)

But isn't it a little strange to use tax payers' dollars to insult discredit and otherwise shoot down an organization that as far as they knew counted only their own Chairperson among its members?? (If Jelliffe did it free, then the Council certainly got what they paid for.)

The report is filled with distortions, inaccuracies, and misrepresentations. When I pointed them out in a series of Letters to the Editor at the time, Jelliffe's responses further demonstrated a warped view of man-woman relationships. Those letters should be in our file in the Library, for I put them there. If they are gone, we can replace them.

One direct result of Jelliffe's attacks in 1986-76 was that a few months later the PEI members of Realwomen formed a provincial chapter, of which I was president until six months ago. We were 30 members then; we are now over 400 and growing. Without Jelliffe's "help" we probably wouldn't have bothered.

Readers should be aware that when we point out that Ms. Jelliffe distorts RW positions, she tells us we don't know what we stand for. She proceeds to tell us what SHE says we stand for, and then attacks her own creation.

I've been on the National Board of RW for five years, helping to shape and express our policy. And I say to this writer what I said to V. Jelliffe in 1987: Don't try to tell us what we are saying. We know what we're saying, but you obviously don't. We also know what YOU'RE saying, its long term implications. Since this letter is already long, I'll mention only one