

A picture of police brutality is worth a thousand words

YOU'VE SEEN THE PHOTOS: A YOUNG WOMAN, handcuffed, receiving a "head stun," and then being pushed to the ground by a cop. The series of images is shocking and, one would assume, incriminating. However, the Crown prosecutor's office says the police officer in question should not be charged. According to the 2 November edition of the *Edmonton Journal*, "Chief Calgary prosecutor Gordon Wong said a review of the case determined that there was not a reasonable likelihood of a conviction that the use of force was excessive." Ultimately the decision to press criminal charges lies with police Chief Michael Boyd.

The woman's lawyer was also quoted as saying that "the pictures speak for themselves. What's going on here is a stretch to avoid charging police officers. ... My concern is that we are sending a message to our police department that if someone, verbally, without being aggressive, is being impolite, then police have an open ticket to get violent with that individual."

We don't know exactly what happened before the photos were taken or who said what to whom. There are, however, two things we do know: that the woman in question sustained soft tissue injuries, a concussion and broken teeth, among other injuries; and that the events depicted in the photographs actually occurred. But the point should not be that we have a picture of a woman being hit. The point should be that the cop in question was using excessive force—an issue that's come up several times in the past as well.

Take, for instance, the Canada Day riots of 2001. With so much vandalism and so few arrests, police went to the media asking them to publish pictures of suspects, apparently in hopes that public shaming would make their jobs easier. They all refused, though EPS did end up posting pictures on their website.

Photos can be deceiving. They can be taken at such an angle as to obscure a detail or deceive the viewer as to the subject's intent. The angle may be unusual or the perspective skewed. A sequence of photographs allows us to interpolate a sequence of events with relative certainty. It's therefore difficult to argue with a sequence of images that are taken in such a fashion as to show, without distortion, the events that came to pass.

Naturally there are other questions that arise. What if the pictures had never been taken? Would we still be discussing this case? And where does this leave photographers and the media—are we slowly going to become their eyes and ears on the streets?

There's a major disconnect taking place here. With the Whyte Avenue riots, we saw press photos being used in an attempt to find wrongdoers from images in which it may or may not be clear what exactly the individuals are doing. With the more recent incident, Chief Crown prosecutor Wong is saying that "the photographs do not tell the entire story of that night. They only give us a few split seconds of what occurred between the police officer and the lady."

It is human nature to protect our own, but police have to be accountable to the public as well as themselves. The EPS lists as its core values: integrity, accountability and respect, and for them to be selective as to when they rely on photographic evidence is hypocritical at best.

KRYSTINA SULATYCKI
Photo Editor

It's Saddam shame

So, two days before the Republicans were to face the music in the congressional elections, Saddam Hussein's trial comes to a sudden and decisive head-opping end. It's important to keep in mind at this point that displacing tyrannical leaders and "freeing the people" was not why the US went into Iraq in the first place, nor is it why they're there now. Hussein terrorized his own people with impunity for years, and his recent removal, the one circumstantial bonus in America's miserable campaign, should not be confused with upright global justice.

ADAM GAUMONT
Opinion Editor

LETTERS

Prusakowski fails to tackle issue, receivers

I would like to convey to you the disappointment and absolute embarrassment I feel towards the *Gateway* in allowing the publication of Ross Prusakowski's classless and insensitive commentary on the downfall of the Bears Football season (re: "QBs football team's weakest Linke," 31 October). The inability of your staff to conjure respectful, insightful and constructive opinions regarding struggling elements of our Athletics program is concerning.

I fail to see the value of isolating one member of a varsity team as the sole reason for a losing season [and] referring to his name in the title of the article as the weakest element of the organization. You and your staff have definitely crossed the line of commentary and slander, and if you fail to distinguish the meaning of these terms, perhaps journalism is not your strongest suit.

What is disturbing is Mr Prusakowski's lack of tact, poise and simple understanding of a team game. Which is even more astonishing being that, at his request some time ago, Mr Prusakowski was allowed to dress and practice with the team in order for him to gain a unique perspective of the game. Clearly he failed to notice the other 64 players on the field and that each and every player on that team contributes to a win or loss.

At this level of amateur athletics, one player cannot and should not be sourced publicly as the disappointment of an entire season. If that line of thinking was suctioned elsewhere, it would be equally poignant to say that Mr Prusakowski has single-handedly corrupted the validity of the *Gateway* by displaying, with clarity, that your organization is more interested in political gimmickry than supporting and fostering a healthy campus attitude.

I sincerely hope that in the future you show a sense of restraint when publishing articles that are insulting and demeaning to an individual's efforts. Further, I urge you to focus on your responsibility to your readers and realize that your comments can be inappropriate and disrespectful.

NEIL PARASYNCHUK
President
University Athletics Board

Dekes only temporarily fucked up, Berry

Being a University of Alberta alumnus, working professional, and active volunteer at the University of Alberta, I regret to have picked up an article of your *Gateway* this week. The article, entitled "A Different Kind of Show" (31 October), was difficult to consume considering the insulting content directed towards the Delta Kappa Epsilon Men's Fraternity, a fraternity which I am an alumnus of.

The "eternal fuckups" as mentioned in this article are personal friends, colleagues, and associates of mine and are among some of the most brilliant leaders in their chosen fields, which range from politics, business, law, engineering and medicine. The "eternal fuckups" support charity efforts at the University of Alberta and in



CONAL PIERSE

Edmonton, including YES, Food for Thought, The Cross Cancer Institute, and others. The "eternal fuckups" consist of some of the hardest-working students, who hold distinctions with the University. Your insulting article is deplorable, given it misconstrues details and insults our broad membership in a personal way.

As a student at the University many years ago, I enjoyed and prided myself on being part of the *Gateway* team. Standards have certainly dropped since then, when the paper resorts to such journalism. Improperly sourced photographs, misrepresentation, and outright defamation are not activities I would expect from the *Gateway*. I would be interested to find out what ethical standards the Students' Union holds the *Gateway* to, when it partakes in such journalism. Further, I would be interested to find out how The University of Alberta Alumni Association and Students' Union feels when alumni of the University read such content. I appreciate an entertaining article, but there are standards and limits.

JORJ SAYDE
Alumnus

Frat feature doesn't help Dekes' image one iota

I can't help but to be offended by your article. I am a Deke, and while I can understand some of your points, I believe the degree of slandering you've just dealt out was uncalled for. So I am writing to you to clarify some points that you've obviously misunderstood.

The jumpsuits were not guarding the maze, they are placed there to go over the simple rules and to take your lighters and smokes away to prevent fire hazards. Anyone is allowed in the maze but we "guard" it to make sure everyone is safe.

There were three options there

for your drinking pleasure. For the first time ever we allowed a new company to serve vodka coolers. Yes the marketing rep was a Deke from the United States, [but] we do have a rep [from] Bigrock and so you could have opted for legendary Deke Punch (which obviously you didn't like) or keg beer.

When the police come to our house it is to check up on things, we contact them and allow them to walk through our parties, again for everyone's safety.

I'd advise you check out the website (www.uofadekes.org) and get some real insight from our social chair before continuing to misrepresent facts. I could critique your poor grammar and writing style but hey I'm a science student what do I know about your literary genius.

RYAN HANSEN
Deke

Bus beats biking in winter months

I would like to thank Rob Found and Chris Young for valiantly sticking up for my rights as a fellow cyclist—assuming they actually ride bikes (re: "Students' Union puts U, one S in 'useless,'" 26 October; "U-Pass not so Universal," 31 October). I guess I have the right to bike for an hour-plus every day throughout the winter in extreme temperatures and on dangerous roads. I guess I also have the right to pay \$300-plus for bus passes during those winter months if I decide riding my bike is too much effort.

How can you both assume that all people who walk or bike will continue to do so during the winter? Have you checked out the bike racks lately? Do you also think that people who walk or bike will only live and travel in a confined area of Edmonton, never venturing further than their two feet can take them? Even when I lived closer

to the university (a 15-minute walk) I still found myself regularly travelling across town. A U-Pass would have saved me money. I expected to see letters from people who drive complaining about the potential U-Pass fee, not people who walk and bike! For \$75 dollars, unlimited bus/train travel anywhere in the city is a pretty decent deal, no matter what your current form of transportation is.

It seems that I am part of your so-called minority, yet I disagree with you! Am I alone, or is it possible that maybe not all people who walk and bike feel that the U-Pass will oppress them? While riding a bike is great for the environment and for personal health (although promoting it as the only needed form of exercise is absurd), not everyone can ride a bicycle, for a multitude of reasons including physical ability. Something silly like a mandatory bike-purchase/maintenance fee would simply oppress an even smaller minority group who are physically unable to ride a bike—great idea Mr Found! Maybe the next time the two of you decide to stick up for someone else's rights you should think things through a little more carefully.

CHRISTOPHER LANGLOIS
Arts IV

Letters to the editor should be dropped off at room 3-04 of the Students' Union Building, or e-mailed to letters@gateway.ualberta.ca.

The Gateway reserves the right to edit letters for length and clarity, and to refuse publication of any letter it deems racist, sexist, libellous or otherwise hateful in nature. The Gateway also reserves the right to publish letters online.

Letters to the editor should be no longer than 350 words, and should include the author's name, program, year of study and student identification number to be considered for publication.