

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.

You asked for feedback...Now you've got it!

Dear Editor:

I previously noticed that you have been requesting feedback regarding our university paper. I planned to respond earlier but I was busy with midterms, assignments, and the such.

When I first came to UNB, in 1987, I looked forward to Fridays for a humorous and entertaining relief through reading the *Brunswickan*. Through the years I have seen the university paper change... a change for the worst as far as I am concerned. The *Brunswickan* has changed from an entertaining publication for the general populace to a medium for gays, lesbians, and other minority groups to express their desires, beliefs, and problems. I believe that everyone should be able to voice their opinion, but I also believe that the *Brunswickan* has become the voice of the gay populace at UNB and that the *Brunswickan* does not provide general entertainment for the majority of the students who do not wish to read about the problems that gay people have. Is the *Brunswickan* a news paper or a glorified "Dear Abby" column?

To improve the *Brunswickan* I, as well as the many people I have polled, suggest that the *Brunswickan* waste less space on "specialized" columns, return to the more interesting "Personals", and provide a more comic yet informative relief that the majority of the UNB students desire.

"It is not that we hate gays..."

Dear Bruns:

It is not that we hate gays, but why do they feel it necessary to have an entire section devoted to their sexual preference in addition to the space already allotted them. We have yet to see a supplement dedicated to heterosexuality, bisexuality, bestiality, necrophilia and, not to mention, everyone's favorite sadomasochism. Honestly! Can't this space be used for means more profitable to the students of U.N.B. and to the *Brunswickan* itself?

Queer? Why Here? Keep it in the bedroom (not the Bruns)!

Owen Phillips
John Reid

An interesting supplement

Dear Kwame,

Wow! What a great supplement! Hats off to all outside (and inside) *Brunswickan* staff who helped put

it together. The supplement was filled with different views on gay life and lifestyles which is something that is evident in every subculture (?) once you look past the status quo's stereotype.

This is one of but many supplements on different groups in our society and on our campus, I hope. This is how we learn to communicate as human beings; by first learning about each others' perspectives on life. I particularly found the article on the treatment of homosexuals by the Nazis of interest. It is interesting that the only ones to be slaughtered in Nazi Germany, as far as my high school education was concerned, were the Jews. It is interesting to discover yet another omission from history lessons about groups or subcultures (? Damnit it's not the word I'm looking for.) being singled out for destruction. [I like to think that if I try to look through the eyes of the oppressed, I, as a white, anglo-saxon, physically abled, straight male from a Judeo-Christian society, am less likely to uphold the status quo as an oppressor. This supplement taught me things I didn't know before I read it, and that, as always, is something which is/will be of use to me for the rest of my cognitive days.

Thanks,
Nick Oliver.

A tragic Catastrophe

Dear Editor,

Did you have the misfortune of attending The Tragically Hip concert on Friday, march 15? The performance by Lord Downie and the Boys was incredible, but the organization and crowd control sucked.

First of all the concert opened an hour and half after the time printed on the tickets. This gave the money hungry organizers ample opportunity to throw gas on an already alcohol fueled fire. Why wasn't alcohol just poured down the throats of everyone who entered the concert? Is it any wonder the situation was as bad as it was?

What a great idea it was to lay tables on their sides in front of the stage! Who the hell decided to do that? At the Northern Pikes concert the tables stood upright and accomplished what they were supposed to do. Maybe the organizers figured the crowd would be too drunk to hop over the tables. This caused more problems than it solved because people were forced to avoid being crushed by moving closer to the stage. Others were standing upon the tables and diving into the crowd. By this time the CP's had lost any control they once possessed and were crouched upon the stage. It seemed as if they began randomly pulling people out

of the crowd and onto the stage disrupting the performance of the Hip. In one pitiful display of crowd control one female CP threw beer in an innocent unsuspecting fan's face and then followed with the empty cup. What a shock this action didn't force the crowd to move back immediately.

The concert ended without an encore much to the displeasure of the frenzied crowd and to the delight of the distraught CPs. The Tragically Hip was very disappointed with the UNB crowd and who could blame them? The blame, however, should not fall entirely on the shoulders of the crowd which would be the easy way out. The actions of the Campus Police were pathetic, but they were thrown into a very difficult situation and probably did the best they could do under the circumstances and lack of proper training.

In order to improve concerts of this magnitude the organizers should worry less about selling alcohol and more about the safety of their patrons and guest bands. If they wanted to make money on the sale of alcohol, it should have been sold at the line up for the tickets. They would have made a bundle. The SUB cafeteria is not the best spot for concerts. There were many people who stood in line for tickets but didn't get any. Surely there could have been twice as many tickets sold. Is the Aitken Centre not the property of the university? Why aren't concerts held there? More ticket sales mean more money and that seems to be what motivated the organizers. We hope that a full apology was offered to The Hip and if not one will be soon.

Yours truly,
two bruised, battered, crushed
and hungover Hip fans
Derek Prowell
David Murray

Weekly dose not enough?

I guess the *Brunswickan* decided that our weekly dose of Terry Richards' verbal whining was not enough and that we needed a good eight page dose to clarify things. It contained all the usual counter-arguments about scripture interpretation, coming out syndrome, discrimination of all sorts and all those various horror stories kept on file for supplements such as this one. It would appear to me that there is one underlying assumption to all pro gay and lesbian arguments that needs to be addressed and that is the assumption that homosexuality is "normal" or "natural".

Because men now lives in an artificially supported environment called "civilization", I will turn to the animal kingdom for possible reference to "normal" or "natural". One of the most widely accepted

premisses in the biological world that is used to measure the success of a species is its "fitness". Loosely defined, fitness in described as all aspects of a species and its environment combined that ensure long term reproductive success. Individuals of a species that are not "fit" do not reproduce and hence their next generation. It is often said that there are examples of homosexuality in the animal kingdom and I believe that it's probably true to some degree. If we use our definition stated above then these individuals contribute nothing to the overall fitness of the species and are thus selected out of existence. If this trait was not selected out of a species it wouldn't take long for that particular species to go extinct. If one in ten males in the human population is gay then one would expect to see similar numbers in the animal kingdom among males. The fact that this does not occur in any species that I know of would indicate to me that homosexuality is not "normal" or "natural" but in some way, for good or bad is supported by our artificial environment called "civilization". It is very apparent to me that homosexuality is a direct contradiction to the very powerful forces of nature that have operated on this planet and all its inhabitants for billions of years.

Ross Millar

"Get used to it"- too confrontational

Some people are uncomfortable with homosexuality and it is not my place to judge whether or not these feelings are justified. However, these feelings are real and often quite strong.

It is because of these feelings that I must question the use of the phrase, "get used to it", found on the front page of the gay and lesbian supplement in last weeks issue of the *Brunswickan*. Although this phrase may strike a unifying role among gays and gay sympathizers alike, it has, perhaps accidentally, aggravated and reinforced anti-gay sentiments. Surely this is not in the best interest of the gay community.

I don't feel qualified to suggest how the gay community might alleviate their problems, but can suggest that intimidation is likely not the answer. It is important to remember that it is the anti-gay members of society that must be reached, not the gays or gay sympathizers if any ground is to be gained in the name of the "gay movement".

Richard Hall.

The Bible and homosexuality

Dear Editor,

In the article "Homosexuality and Christianity: a personal view" by Adrian Park, the author makes several attempts to use the Bible and the writings of scholars to prove homosexuality is not sin. Unfortunately, he does not succeed.

Mr. Park begins with Genesis 19:5. He cites this as the "key passage" in fact, this verse is only a sentence taken from a paragraph comprising verses 4 through 11. In the verses following verse 5 Lot pleads with the men of Sodom "do not so wickedly" verse 7(KJV) then he offers his "two daughters which have not known men. . .and do with them as is good in your eyes." verse 8.

If the towns people intended just to determine who these men (the angels) were, as Mr. Park states, why did Lot offer the mob his daughters in their stead. The alternative given by Lot is no less wicked as the one demanded by the mob, but, Lot had never been known for his good judgement.

As to the other Old Testament references Mr. Park mentions I will give him the benefit of the doubt. Though the rest of the article I strongly disagree with. Mr. Park relies on "many modern scholars", using their writings to disprove the validity of the books that are traditionally credited to Paul (Romans, I and II Timothy and I and II Corinthians). Although there is an ongoing debate on the authorship of these books the fact that these books belong in the Bible and are an important part of it is unquestioned. Before believing the works of modern scholars one should check their credibility.

As stated in II Timothy 3:16 "All scripture is given by inspiration of God. . ." this is supported by II Peter 1:21 and II Samuel 23:2. The Bible was written by god through man. So, if Paul in actuality did not write the books credited to him it is irrelevant because originally it came from God.

Romans 1:27 states "In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. . ." (NIV), verse 26 shows that women were guilty of this sin also. By comparing this to other versions, KJV, RSV, The Living Bible, etc. it is found that these verses are clear in their intent.

In I Corinthians 6:9 many modern versions, such as the NIV, actually use the word homosexual. "don't you know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? . . .nor homosexual offender.(NIV). Again after com-