"Star Wars" worse than "Deep Throat"

To the Editor:

We were amazed to learn that the registered Registration Day movie had been withdrawn, and somewhat bemused by what took its place. Apparently, some members of the MIT community objected to "Deep Throat" on some moral ground. There are, however, moral grounds upon which one can object to "Star Wars."

"Star Wars" is an extremely violent movie. The hero, who is in theory—a innocent farm boy, becomes a remorseless killing machine when the occasion presents itself. Everyone else in the movie is violent also—consistently violent.

It is the remorseless nature of the violence in "Star Wars" which makes the film so distasteful. Deaths are bloodless, impersonal, and sanitized (not to mention frequent). Rather than causing the viewer to empathize with the horrors of warfare, "Star Wars" anesthetizes the viewer to the horrors he or she has seen.

"Deep Throat" is not a clean, All-American film. It is a graphic (and crude) movie dealing with sexual acts. We have heard many arguments that it is degrading to females. (One of us feels the film is more degrading to males.) We feel that the argument is, however, irrelevant.

It is our experience that those opposed to such films worry about what people will think after seeing one. We are concerned about what people will think after being numbed by "Star Wars." Remorseless violence is probably more insidious than sexuality carried to absurd extremes. Society trains us all too well for "Deep Throat" to be a danger; we are not sure about "Star Wars."
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