Whoopi’s win stands out

Column by Bill Jackson

The Oscars are now over a week old, and it seems to me that nobody picked up on the true excitement of this year’s awards.

No, it wasn’t Dances with Wolves, although that movie took best picture and best director. Dances was a silly little western, and it was very natural for the Academy to vote for it for many reasons. It was a “message” film, and one that also brought back a genre, the westerns, which many older Academy voters remember fondly from their youths. It was an epic three-hour-long film, the kind Hollywood isn’t supposed to make anymore. And finally, it had a handsome young star who put his neck on the line by directing and producing the film as well.

And no, the excitement of the awards ceremony wasn’t when Kathy Bates won for her star turn in Misery, although it was nice to finally see an award being given to someone who couldn’t expect to exchange boos with a Marlee Matlin doll without anyone noticing. Bates deserved award every step of the way.

No, it wasn’t the Oscar Joe Pesci won for his supporting role in GoodFellas. It was good to see the usually overlooked Pesci win for a brilliant performance as one of the most memorable movie. And let’s hear it for his one- sentence acceptance speech, the best one of the evening: After paying his dues in Heat, he was clearly Pesci will now be able to demand better roles.

The most exciting moment was when Whoopi Goldberg won the Oscar for best supporting actress for her role in Ghost.

It was a deserved award, there can be no doubt. Whoopi was the best-acted role in reality for any major movie, happy and overcome- love story. Her performance is hysteric and yet still believable. She was, at least for me, the star of the film. Her film career so far has been one of dizzying highs (The Color Purple) and eras (Jumpin’ Jack Flash), but this Oscar is sure to improve her standing in the eyes of many casting agents.

Much has been made of Whoopi being the second black woman to win a supporting actress Oscar since the first, Hattie McDaniel, won for Gone With the Wind in 1939. But the only- people who play this up and, at the point, the Oscar Whoopi received is much more than that. If you don’t see the role Whoopi played in Ghost, something.seems to spurt from the grand majority of black roles available in Hollywood today.
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Free speech can’t excuse abuse

I am writing in response to Adam L. Djershowitz G’s recent article in The Tech (“Preserve campus speech,” March 19).

Yes, free speech is important. People should be able to express their opinions. And you must say that you argue your points in a clear, logical manner. There is, however, a limit in a logic. It ignores people; and after all, it is people whom your “free speech” affects.

Free speech means freedom to express what you think, how you feel. It means you can argue with disagreeing. However, there must be a line. Freedom of speech does not give you the right to hurt in- nocent people.

For example, your incitement upon showing Deep Throat con- stitutes a form of sexual harass- ment. This is harassment not be- cause it simply offends people who don’t like sexually explicit films but because showing the film hurls women.

Linda Marciano was brutalized and terrorized in the production of her book and her show. Each time you show that film to prove a point, you are saying ‘Tl have freedom of speech,’ you are admitting that industry abuses women and you further hurt them.

You hurt all of the women who have been raped and forced to perform such sexual acts as you portray in the film. You hurt who you see such people.

Physically, I have no problem with sexually explicit material. The problem is, however, not that it is sexually explicit but that this category is degrading to women. Deep Throat is a perfect example of this. It supports the notion of women as objects for the sole purpose of male sexual pleasure. This is not our function. Con- sequently, the showing of this film is hurtful.

If you want to test your right to show sexually explicit films, there are some which are not de-噪性 film. You could have shown any of them.

However, by making the deci- sion that you did, you are testing your right to show sexually explicit films. What are you saying to people who wish to, preserve, but who are afraid to show your film because you have clearly not been able to show your right to show sexually explicit films. You could have shown any of them.

Perhaps you, not Associate Professor of Law and Science, do not understand what is really at stake. You could have used your con- sensus free speech and the right to express our views, he is merely trying to protect the rights of those oppressed and hurt by peo- ple like you.
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