

# BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the Editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of *The Brunswickan*. Letters to the Editor may be sent to Rm. 35, Student Union Building. Deadline: 5p.m. Tuesdays. Maximum length: 300 words.

## Fishy business

Dear Editor,

There is something fishy going on here. A professor at STU acquires a criminal record for - by his own admission - assaulting a student with a weapon and threatening to kill her. Because, amongst other things, he is "active in the community and at St. Thomas University," his lawyer asks that he be given a discharge and the judge gives him a probationary sentence. The University President, in turn, considers it would place the professor—a teacher of social psychology—in "double jeopardy" to remove him from the classroom.

Double jeopardy or a double break? First, the professor gets off lightly in court. Compare the sentence of the professor - a wrist-slap fine of \$345, counselling sessions, and six months probation - with that of another man issuing a death threat to a woman student on the UNB campus last spring who got 4 months in jail. And remember, the professor brandished a yard-long iron poker within inches of the head of the victim (his wife), while the jailed man was unarmed. Remember, too, that the professor was accused of two charges of assault (though he plea bargained down to just one), and that a wife does not walk out the door until she has suffered, on average, 42 beatings (NB Advisory Council on the Status of Women statistic).

Furthermore, the judge presumably did consider the professor something of a menace to society since she ordered him to attend special classes for controlling abuse. Does the University administration also think him something of a liability in the classroom — the psychology classroom — at least until his therapy runs its course? Apparently not, although it has banned him for a year at a time from STU pubs because of scuffles with campus police — including one incident involving force against a female student officer.

The fact that the student who was assaulted in the court case was the professor's wife should not be allowed to mitigate the crime. If anything, she is the one in "double jeopardy." Like most abused wives, she could stop the abuse only by leaving her home and her marriage. Despite the fact that her mother's money has allowed them to put the down payment on the house and that she contributed every month to the mortgage, she — the victim — ended up with no marriage, no house, no car, a history of abuse, an unfinished degree, and thousands of dollars of legal fees incurred to separate from her

abuser. The professor — the guilty one — gets to keep the house, the car, his salary, and the job — where, ironically, he teaches about human relationships. This man is a social psychologist!

In Newfoundland, the good brothers at Mount Cashel were found guilty of criminal offences and lost their orphanage. In the US, Jimmy Bakker was found guilty of criminal offences and lost his congregation. In BC, Bill Vander Zalm was found guilty of conflict of interest and had to resign his political office. Malpractice? Doctors lose their licence. Criminal record? Lawyers get disbarred. Can't get bonded? Don't apply for work with King's Landing or Molly Maid, but, what the heck, find safe haven as a professor of psychology at STU.

Double jeopardy, double break, or double standard? Why does STU President O'Brien condemn Professor Clow who speaks for peace during the Persian Gulf War but condone Professor Fish who is convicted of violence at home?

Signed,  
Speaking Up for the Doubly  
Jeopardized

## Locked out

Dear Editor,

I am pleased to see that the *Brunswickan* is looking at the issue of media bias during the Bosnitch era, thinking back in retrospect to that time period I can say yes that the *Brunswickan*, and as well CHSR were very anti-student movement, unfortunately their attitudes affected the way they presented the facts to the student body and to some extent the community at large.

My involvement in student politics started in 1979 as Vice President Internal for the Saint Thomas University Student Union. During the next seven years I held other elected positions, from President of the Saint Thomas Student Representative Council to CHSR Station Director. Over this period of time I seen a steady deterioration of Student Voice in student affairs. It appeared that the new breed of student politicians were more interested in their own well being, either while they were students, or what employment benefits would they receive after they graduated if they did not offend the University administrators. With these motives, it was difficult for them to work for the interests of the student at large.

One student leader who did not follow the norm of selling fellow students for personal gain was student leader John Bosnitch, even though we differed on many issues

and his methods of solving some of the political problems that were at hand, we did agree on one principle, and that was, a Democracy for Students in its strict sense.

At its peak the pro student movement led by Bosnitch forced the University to make decisions that were for the benefit of the students. One slap in the face for the University was when the Bosnitch student government forced the University to return \$10.00 of student fees back to the student, this represented \$50,000 the University had to give back!

With the student movement having this kind of power, the University had to start a counter movement to discredit Bosnitch influence.

In 1985 while I was station director for CHSR, I was told by Ken Quiggly who was the Editor in Chief for the *Brunswickan* that the *Brunswickan* was going to start an Anti-Bosnitch campaign, would CHSR follow suit, I refused to partake in such endeavors, the game plan was to only broadcast the Bosnitch failures and ignore the success that he and the student movement had, while at same time broadcast the success of James Downy and the University. This became the catalyst for my unlawful lockout of the radio station.

Hopefully the medias of the present and the future will never slant their communications towards the benefit of one party or the other.

Andre Faust

## Just a cry for attention

Dear Editor,

I feel compelled to respond to John Bosnitch's cry for attention which you published in last week's issue, and since it appears he receives *The Brunswickan* in Tokyo, I thought it might expedite the process if I write to you.

Mr. Bosnitch, I urge you to seek professional help. I am one of those persons remaining on campus who remembers you and your gang, who witnessed the pitiful extent of your need for attention during those years. Since you had gone, I had hoped for your sake that you may have matured and learned to quell your insatiable need for attention. Because I had hoped for your recovery, obviously I was very saddened to read your letter in the April 5, 1991, issue of *The Brunswickan*. It is apparent that your need for attention goes unsated, and I find it very sad that, some 5 years after the fact, you are still trying to rationalize your various misdeeds at the expense of the students of UNB of the early 1980s. Once again, please get some

help.

Sincerely,  
Mike Comeau

## Awfully careless with truth

Dear Editor,

John Bosnitch's letter in the April 5th *Brunswickan* reminds me of something my grandfather used to say: "He doesn't lie but he's awfully careless with the truth."

Despite this, I think a good feature on the issues John has addressed is warranted. Bosnitch certainly wasn't all bad and his enemies certainly weren't all good.

Sincerely,  
Neil Toner

## In praise of...

Dear Editor,

Every week the *Brunswickan* comes off the press and most students try not to miss it because it keeps us informed of the latest events around campus. The *Brunswickan* links us to the news in our own City and the news abroad. We also read about the latest bands that have passed through the City or that will be coming to the City. We can also see the top 40 playlist for CHSR-FM and from the distractions section of the *Brunswickan* we can read and appreciate the poems written by our fellow students.

I have two points to make with this letter. The first point is congratulations to the *Brunswickan* Staff for giving us (the students) a great paper. My second point is directed to last week's paper. From cover page to ending page I enjoyed the fact of reading the *Brunswickan* without turning the page and seeing the words "Gay Forum".

G. Collrin

## House woes

Dear Editor,

It is 5:30pm Friday, April 5, and the Ladies of Tibbits are outside enjoying a barbecue which they have been invited to by the men of my house. I am a member of the house committee and therefore feel I should be down representing the house, but I am not because I am so frustrated and upset due to the orientation meeting that I have just attended. I feel I must relay these feelings to the student population.

The board of Dons (chaired by Mary Lou Stirling, Dean of Residence) has successfully taken all control over orientation week away from the students, and given this control to the dons. I have spent the previous hour arguing and

complaining to the Don of my house about the way the administration is abusing their power, and not considering the students wishes or desires on the subject. The discussion came to an end when my don stated, "This is quite a change over previous years where each resident elected house committee had all the control over the activities and therefore it is very difficult for me to accept."

The original system was not only completely changed, but the students were given no previous notification of the changes until they were presented to them in a meeting where the Board of Dons simply stated "These are the changes, so get used to them!" The Board of Dons did not even give an indication to the students what was to be discussed at the meeting and actually took measures to hide it from them.

The changes were so drastic that the RRB organized a protest of resident students larger than any other protest the whole campus has organized all year. There were some changes brought about as a result of the protest and the RRB's efforts but when everything that was lost is considered, no resident can honestly admit that our concerns were actually taken into consideration.

I was extremely upset with what went on, but decided to try and make the best of a bad situation, so when I was asked by the Don to be a member of the committee I gladly accepted as I saw it as an opportunity to have my views considered.

After I presented the events that Neill House had organized at an orientation meeting with committees from all houses, I entertained a large number of questions as to what the events were composed of, and how they were to be run. I also made attempts to justify the events but was reminded that this meeting was not to decide which events would be accepted but instead only to present the ideas.

The meeting to accept or reject the ideas was carried out at the Board of Dons meeting shortly after the presentation meeting. All decisions were made by giving each member of the Board of Dons one vote and the majority rules. No students, other orientation committee members, or any other representatives were asked to attend this meeting.

The Board of Don's is an advisory board to the Dean of Residence and the RRB is also an advisory board. No part in any of the decision-making, from the original procedure to what events were kept, was left up to the RRB, in fact it is quite evident that the students were kept in the dark and neglected from the decisions on purpose.

One example of the events which got rejected was the water runs. A

Continued on page 7

Continued from p. 5  
water run is when  
dents, dressed in  
der T-shirts and s  
front of the male  
male residents th  
on them. Particip  
such as these are s  
The reasons I hav  
the rejection of th  
clude that the uni  
liable if someone  
hurt themselves,  
justifiable purpos  
The university  
to the voluntary a  
the students who p  
be accepting, and  
reason, I wonder  
Don's has ever h  
To end I would  
not an isolated inc  
to have transpire  
attitude the Boar  
Dean of Residence  
sess. They act as  
just children and  
accepting respons  
ing responsible d  
der how these a  
infinite wisdom,  
to be able to learn  
responsibility if v  
permitted to acc  
tude is definitely  
very much insul  
mind the Dean o  
the Board of Don  
are the people w  
is here to accom  
efit from, and at l  
desires, and opin  
pertaining to us  
expressed.

President

## Riot!

Dear Editor,

The Neill Ho  
would like to ad  
which took pla  
evening in front  
It was described  
onlookers, and n  
trol. The Neill H  
can not condone  
Bridges resident  
pathize with an  
emotions which  
tions. This is a  
how frustrated th  
munity is towa  
actions taken by  
ministration.

There was re  
much of the resi  
at the gathering  
Students presen  
pleasure toward  
dence rather th  
Bridges House.  
situation may  
avoided if the d  
the administrat  
flected the view  
rather than only  
administration.

The event wa  
we hope the cha  
cation will not t  
future. We pay  
say!

Neill