

BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of the Brunswickan. Letters may be sent to Rm. 35 in the Student Union Building. Deadline: 1 pm on Tuesday. Usual maximum length: 300 words. Please include name, student number and phone number.

A bloody disgrace

Dear Editor,

It's been almost two terms since the engineering student government has been involved [sic] scandalous events. After the winter term of 92 the E.U.S. has kept a low profile, possibly they have gone under ground. Though all dealings this year have been above board, student government has still been ineffective. The E.U.S. is a farce, - the E.R.T.W. is a farce - and the student union is a sick joke!

This letter has been sent to your paper and not the E.R.T.W. because engineering politics and publications have been treated as a communist state. Any criticisms about engineering related topics are heavily censored by the E.R.T.W., which this year seems to be a joint venture between the paper and the E.U.S.. It's been said that your paper does print or publish engineering concerns, I hope that you will print this.

Some of the big engineering concerns this term are the replacement of the BEAVER MAN, and the termination of student loans. These are issues which the student body has no control over, but yet waste their time and other people's time by sending out petitions to change the world. Just like everyone else I also liked the BEAVERMAN, but maybe beaver foods has valid reasons for replacing him with the new girl.

The engineering student government is planning to send Frank McKenna a petition protesting the possible termination of student bursaries???? Another waste of time and tax payers money. It's time some of you old ladies woke up and smelt the coffee. In case you haven't noticed we are still in a recession and why should the tax payers have to pay for your education and economic mismanagement. Today the welfare, the medical care, and the unemployment services have all been unduly exploited by the selfish and ignorant. For years irresponsible students have been milking the bursary system dry - it has to stop somewhere.

For the past four years I have put \$10,000 away in Canada savings bonds, and because of my taxable income on these bonds, I am unable to get a student loan or a bursary. Some might say why would you want to draw one, you have lots of money to cover the costs? Unfortunately for people like myself this is the way the government sees it. So why can't I get a student loan? — discrimination!!!! Because I am responsible, get a summer job, do not drink or smoke, live very modestly, shop at the lower valued stores and scrimp and save — I am restricted from getting any financial aid. So for you irresponsible

people who have 12,000 dollar student loans don't come crying on my shoulder. Instead of wasting your time and my money sending out SILLY petitions try the following.

MANAGE YOUR MONEY
DON'T BE MATERIALISTIC
WHEN SHOPPING
STOP THE PARTYING, DRINKING AND SMOKING
DON'T GO TO FLORIDA ON MARCH BREAK
CUT DOWN ON RESTAURANT FOOD
EAT 3 MODERATE MEALS A DAY
BUY ONLY NECESSITIES

For those of you who do not meet these requirements it's time to shape up!!!!

Marc Duschene

Experiencing violence at school

Dear Editor,

For the past three years, my daughter has experienced many incidents of violence by other students at the Priestman Street Elementary school. These episodes have taken place both in the halls of the school, and on the playgrounds.

The school has in attendance approximately 700 students divided between two playgrounds. For approximately 350 students on one playground, there are no more than two supervising teachers - a ratio of 175 to one. To properly supervise and intimidate aggression would require many more teachers on the playgrounds during recess times than is feasibly possible.

The problem I have with the violence taking place is that it seems to be going unnoticed; and even when it is brought to someone's attention, the manner in which it is dealt with does not ensure the elimination or reduction of the aggression. In many instances, the violence is not being viewed as a problem.

We, as parents, must do something to help alleviate - or at least seriously reduce - the many occurrences of violence on our children's school grounds. There are many successful programs being implemented in school curriculums in other provinces across the country. What is taking New Brunswick so long to adopt any one of these proven successful programs as part of its school curriculum? The time has come for us to stand up and take part in a safer world.

I am looking forward to discussing this matter further with other parents experiencing the same difficulties. Regardless of your location, and the school your child attends, I welcome hearing from you. Talking about this issue/problem will prove, I am confi-

dent, to be the first step in changing the violent conditions prevalent on our school's playgrounds. I am tired of seeing my daughter hurt and afraid to go to school everyday. Please, feel free to contact me at 459-4942.

Sandra Foster

Article deserves closer examination

Dear Editor,

John Valk's interesting yet offensive notion of the "perils of individualism" is certainly deserving of closer examination. Discussion certainly has its merits, inasmuch as it is confined to an individual perspective. Here is mine.

We are somewhat handicapped by what amounts to a noticeable lack of cohesiveness in Valk's argument. For instance, is he really advocating the use of the Christian church as a forum for enlightened discussion? As has always been the case, such attempts can only be met with resistance: open-mindedness, thought's saving grace, becomes a measure of heresy - "thy name be Satan."

If Valk is suggesting that, instead, an infrastructure be set up to encourage and facilitate the collective practice of "spiritualism" among those who dare to think for themselves vis a vis the nature of reality, his assertion that church attendance is in decline would be encouraging rather than alarming. In any case, such an institution while being preferable to what is now in place, is nonetheless founded on the same grievous premise - validity by exclusion.

Reality is of course, all inclusive, to deny this pervasive truth is to practice deception by denial - erecting pernicious barriers toward what is ultimately sought. This principle not only applies to ontological inquiry, it extends throughout the entire spectrum of consciousness: narrow resolve by definition, confines both awareness and utility.

To make matters worse, a collective ideology can only be formed through perversion of individual ideas; what results is no more than a collective subversion. If the ideas of a dominant individual take precedence, though, this constitutes enlightenment by force, which can only be disruptive for the recipient. An interchange of ideas is not necessarily counterproductive, but it is a matter of personal context - the idea of a collective reality is a grand illusion. Through this, one feels justified in claiming the souls of others as property: here is what is right and here is what is wrong. It is only when this illusion is dispelled that an unadulterated collusion of utility, implied and not extracted, can be allowed to exist. (Which is to say - oneness)

Oneness is by no means collective in the exogenous sense. Exogenous focus only leads to a sense of alienation. Identity with the self and Entirety can only be accomplished through endogenous focus. Holism, or spirituality if you like (I don't, since all things are a function of spirit), is the relationship of "One", necessarily, must be "All". (If you prefer the term "God", so be it - I find it far too connotative and thus limiting) "All" represents the simultaneous expression of Possibility, and our experience is broadened only by capturing within our personal reference the greater degree of all. Thus, the greatest and least of all reality is contained within one within the individual.

To suggest, as Valk does, that looking inside one's soul amounts to deception is ludicrous. What is to be gained by belittling ourselves, casting off the very fundamentality of our existence? Enlightenment through submission is to deny the very possibility of understanding. If we are to achieve a greater

state, we must expand our awareness, not pervert it.

Speaking of perversions, the denial of the enjoyment of "this world" in deference to a higher or better one is a self-abusive practice. This leads to the distinction which Valk and others refer to as the "secular" (whatever that means), an evil to be admonished. Since this "secular" world is our primary focus in this sphere of consciousness, it is understandable why a suppression of awareness would be tantamount to the maintenance of this dogma. But, as all is subjective, there can be no inherent distinction made between the "secular" and "spiritual". All is spirit, whether expressed in transcendental or symbolic terms. When we reject this world for being too symbolic, we reject ourselves in turn.

We can all huddle together in a quasi-communal setting, and try to purge ourselves of our only true possession - our unique spirit - for as long as we like.

We can all huddle together in a quasi-communal setting, and try to purge ourselves of our only true possession - our unique spirit - for as long as we like. As narrow, inflexible, and deprived as we may possibly become, we cannot change the one constant and inalienable truth - reality is a self-contained and self-defined phenomenon.

A. J. Carisse

Reverse discrimination

Dear Editor,

After reading Valerie Kilfoil's Wimmin's Room article on reverse discrimination, I can't believe that feminists are as out of touch with reality as she pretends to be.

I admit, males, especially white males, had everything all their own way in the past, but is it fair to the white male entering the work force today, to hire women or "visible minorities" with lower qualifications, to fill a certain percentage of positions?

Equality must start today. We can't rewrite the past. These young men shouldn't be punished for the sins of their fathers, grandfathers, etc.

In the case mentioned of the Toronto firefighters, I read an article in the last Reader's Digest, that told white males in Ont. now have to make a score 15% higher than women or members of "visible minority" groups to qualify as firefighters or for many other positions under new NDP legislation. Is this equality? I think not.

As for her contention that 52% of politicians should be women, as women represent 52% of the population, if as many women as men would get involved in politics, they probably would hold half or more of the political positions.

So, my advice to feminists, if women are truly equal to men, and I believe that they are, start acting equal and you will soon achieve equality. Whiners don't cut it in the real world, they only create resentment.

M. L. Fleming

Two questions for Mr. Valcourt

Dear Editor,

Regarding the proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act by the Minister of Employment And Immigration Bernard Valcourt and his announcement that each case would be judged fairly and individually, I have two questions which I would like Mr. Valcourt to answer.

If a person takes a drunken motorcyle ride, gets chased by the police,

slams into a fence and loses the sight in one eye, they would not be able to work due to the injury. What I was wondering was, would that person qualify for UIC under your proposed new UIC rules?

Please tell me, because I know of a Cabinet minister who did the very same thing and although he stepped down from the Cabinet, he continued to get paid top dollar during his period of infirmity. In fact, he was invited to stay at the Prime Minister's private cottage to recuperate after the incident, and within months he got a promotion. I was wondering what he knew that other Canadians didn't?

Yours most sincerely,
Melynda Jarratt

Being regarded as a criminal

Dear Editor,

On Tuesday, February 16 around 9:30 in the evening, I found myself walking home from the University. When I was less than a block away from my home a young woman came out onto the sidewalk in front of me. She was carrying a large hockey bag which I assumed was filled with laundry. I immediately felt awkward because the woman was hurrying her step and looking back nervously over her shoulder. I realize that this reaction can be easily understood because of the common occurrence of violence towards women in our society. Since I've heard of similar situations, I knew that I should cross to the other side walk, or turn around and find another way home. However there was only one side walk on this street and I was already very close to home. I decided to slow down my walking pace. As I continued to walk home, the woman appeared to become increasingly nervous, and I felt more awkward. The woman rounded the corner near the ARP pharmacy on Connaught Street and was out of my sight. I continued along and eventually came around the same corner. The woman had stopped and when she saw me she bolted through the door in the building and I heard the door nervously lock behind her. I continued to walk home for I was now less than 100 metres from home. I felt very strange and scared. I unknowingly had frightened a young woman just by walking home. I felt so ashamed to be a man because I was viewed as a criminal but I had committed no crime. But had I? Had the young woman not been harassed? Should I be regarded a criminal because I am a man?

I feel that there were two victims in this incident. The young woman was obviously frightened and probably feels that she was harassed, and I felt that I was regarded as a criminal even though I was aware of what was happening and tried to avoid an uncomfortable situation.

I feel that there were two victims in this incident. The young woman was obviously frightened and probably feels that she was harassed, and I felt that I was regarded as a criminal even though I was aware of what was happening and tried to avoid an uncomfortable situation. I sincerely hope that the young woman reads this letter. I feel so badly for what you must have went through. I also hope that women who read this letter can see the other side of a common situation and understand the feelings of concerned men in today's society who feel that they are being wrongly judged because of the fear of men. A fear that is warranted because of increasing violence towards women.

Doug Folkins

CONTACT LENSES

STUDENT SPECIAL
SOFT CONTACT LENSES

GUARANTEED FIT
EXTENSIVE
FOLLOW-UP
CARE

COMPREHENSIVE
SERVICE PROGRAM
CLOSE TO CAMPUS
& HIGH SCHOOL

159.

REG. \$250.00

CERTAIN
EXCEPTIONS APPLY

EXPIRES FEB 28/93

DAVID G. HARDING
CONTACT LENS SPECIALIST
SUITE 504, 1015 REGENT STREET
FREDERICTON MEDICAL CLINIC
458-0270