

EDITORIAL

Who draws the line anyway? Over the last few weeks a small number of individuals have called me to lodge complaints with *The Brunswickan* in regard to our decisions as to which ads run in this paper. Often the inquiry is phrased as, "who decides which ads will run in the paper anyway?" However, today the complainant phrased the question more cleverly by asking if we researched our advertisers. Further, did we know that by running these ads that we were promoting those industries?

As the Editor-in-Chief of *The Brunswickan* the dubious honour of deciding which ads will run in the paper falls on me as the one responsible for the content of the paper. However, I am not alone in deciding what goes into the paper: I can rely upon the sensibilities of my staff and have been provided with criteria for rejecting inappropriate material. This criteria comes in the form of our objectives as they are stated in our bylaws.

"c.i. to provide a forum for students to express ideas and opinions on such events and issues deemed of interest to the student population, provided that these are not deemed discriminatory based on sex, race, physical and/or mental disability, religion or sexual orientation.

ii. to define discriminatory material for the purpose of section (c.i.) as material which:

-does not recognise the intellectual and emotional equality of persons of any given sex, race, physical and/or mental disability, religion or sexual orientation.

-uses derogatory terms affecting persons of a given sex, race, physical and/or mental disability, religion or sexual orientation.

-includes unjustifiable stereotypes of persons of a given sex, race, physical and/or mental disability, religion or sexual orientation.

-involves gratuitous exploitation of persons of a given sex, race, physical and/or mental disability, religion or sexual orientation.

iii. to recognise that this policy is applicable to all sections of *The Brunswickan*."

These criteria are necessarily subjective in order that they may be applied to a variety of situations. The paper in any given issue is required to judge a number of submissions, advertising and otherwise, on the basis of their violating the objectives of the paper. This invariably leads to conflicts with some members of our audience, but we are trying to appeal to the majority of the student community and feel that by and large we meet our objectives as stated in the bylaws.

As a student newspaper we tend to be more liberal-minded in regard to what we accept as appropriate for our audience than those in the mainstream media. While we do not accept copy which is sexist, racist, homophobic, libellous or defamatory, we sometimes push the bounds of good taste. But, when it comes to advertising, our policy is that by the time students reach university they should possess the maturity to make certain decisions for themselves and what businesses and events they wish to patronise are their own affair. The newspaper like any other business requires revenue in order to operate and we obtain this through the sale of advertising. It is the nature of advertising to promote businesses and by this definition we promote many businesses. Promoting them is a far cry from endorsing them.



One merry and fine morning as I was exiting the SUB on my way to the library to get a couple of books—books with lots of pictures because I hate reading—I happened to spot a very informative placard attached haphazardly to the glass doors. In my direct line of (blurred) vision was sign reading 'DANGER FALLING MICE'. At first I was somewhat puzzled, but my sharp intellect calmly sorted out my dilemma. I reread the sign just to make sure my Hooked on Phonics programme had not betrayed me and I should indeed be wary of falling rodents. I imagined several scenarios of falling mice. The first image to come to mind involved a conglomerate of depressed mice committing mass suicide by leaping to their deaths. The popping of their tiny eggshell-like skulls and red pulpy gel spattering my shoes as they hit the cold reality of concrete horrified me. My second vision was less terrifying because it consisted of drunken mice in sailor suits dancing off the roof without care or morals. I guess they looked sort of like that sailor guy from the Village People. Why those little critters would sacrifice themselves to polyester imprisonment is beyond me. They have everything to live for! I had additional thoughts but by then the remnants of my wit were lost on the prospects of getting a big book from the library with lots of pretty pictures.

I thought it was nice of the SUB to warn me of the mice, so I went on my way cautiously. After all, I didn't want to step in anything. As I was opening the door, what appeared to be several tonnes of snow and ice fell in front of me. Now imagine that: ice and snow was falling too.

It always amazes me how every year citizens around this City of Stately Elms post their poultry scrawled signs in their ratty old window sills or somewhere in the approximate area where snow and ice don't fall all in hopes of trying to save their butts from a lawsuit. The university is no exception. Physical plant or whoever has enough gumption goes around to each building and sticks up the obligatory warning. In the three years I have spent at UNB not once have I ever noticed these signs stopping any icy dagger plummeting towards an individual. However I did notice that when an entryway is engineered with proper eaves no one gets hurt.

What I am about to suggest might be highly unorthodox and a novel idea, but why not simply invest in some eaves that won't allow ice to either form in high traffic areas or some sort of protection in these areas should engineers fail us in their attempts to stop the ice? I am positive with the amount of highly skilled engineers that have passed through our gates, a solution can be found.

Oh, I will apologise to sign makers in town: I am sorry that I want to take away your contribution to our groovy little campus but why not save all that paper for *really important* and *swell* things like the upcoming student union elections? Like anyone cares anyway.

—Sincerely, Gray Zurheide, Captain Varsity Reds Soccer, Coach U-15 Halifax H.H. Marshall

Blood n' Thunder

SMART PACC ALLEVIATES CONCERNS

Dear Alex T. Bielak,

I am writing in response to your concern about the unavailability of non-alcoholic beer in our campus bar, and I hope that I can clarify the situation for you.

In the past many bars, including our campus bars, have offered non-alcoholic beers. At that time, they found that the non-alcoholic beers took up a lot of fridge space for storage, and that no one wanted to buy them. They usually ended up throwing out the fermented non-alcoholic beer a few months later. But times do change—we live in an increasingly health conscious society, and people are also choosing to be more responsible about their drinking habits. For these reasons, both of our campus bars presently offers a full range of "Mocktails" (non-alcoholic cocktails) at low prices, and both bars also have designated driver programs. If you feel that a campus bar is missing something like non-alcoholic beer, then you have every right to make an inquiry to the management of these bars. Unlike other bars in the city, the campus bars are your bars—where students are members and owners.

As a director of The Cellar, I am proud to tell you that we now stock "Labatt's 0.5" as a result of several people asking for non-alcoholic beers. The Cellar feels that it is important to look after the needs of students, to promote responsibility, and hey—it's your bar!

I hope you understand now that the stocking and inventory of the campus bar is not in the mandate of Team SMART PACC, nor should it be. For this reason, your concern about the judging of the national awards should be alleviated, as things beyond Team SMART PACC's control do not usually rank as important components of our program. Bacchus Canada, who judges the awards, tends to focus more on what the alcohol education groups across Canada do, not what they don't do.

I am glad that you voiced your concern, because you have every right to—these are your bars. I am also glad that you are aware of your options about drinking. I agree that if you choose to drink responsibly, it should be an easy and accessible alternative for everyone.

—Sincerely, Lisa Lane, Coordinator, Team SMART PACC

VIEW FROM CHEAP SEATS "IMMATURE"

Dear Mark Savoie,

Let me first begin by saying that I have enjoyed your section, "View From the Cheap Seats." However, in regards to your latest article on the Eric Cantona situation I think you are totally wrong! You speak of this matter as if you are an immature, unprofessional, smart-ass fifteen year-old. It is ridiculous of you to suggest that a fan "... deserves to get the crap kicked out of him/her..." What kind of world would we live in, or in fact, do we live in that someone has the right to brutally attack anyone no matter what the circumstance. Further, regardless of any wrong doing in the first place by either the fan or Cantona, the Football Association of England has reacted strongly, appropriately and certainly could not stand idly by. This is a serious incident that the whole world saw and by the FA not doing anything would have been ludicrous as if to condone such an act. Soccer is proud of its disciplinary actions for that is one of the things I think that separates this sport from others. It tries not to tolerate any violence in the game whatsoever unlike your example of hockey where violence is promoted indirectly "... as part of the game." Violence is not the answer to solving such problems. There are certainly better solutions. Anyone who can walk away from such incidences is in my book definitely a better person.

—Sincerely, Gray Zurheide, Captain Varsity Reds Soccer, Coach U-15 Halifax H.H. Marshall

LET'S TALK ABOUT WORLD ORDER FROM THE BAHAI

"All men have been created to carry forward an ever-advancing civilization."

There can be little doubt that the challenges which humankind faces today are immense. There are those which come with the attainment of adulthood. If we meet them successfully, there is the prospect of a golden age of a beauty and depth unimaginably greater than at any other period in our history. If we fail, the future is likely to be one of increasing hostility and, quite probably, of the most horrifying destruction. There seems little chance of a middle way. We grow to meet our destiny, or we sink to the lowest depths.

"The world's equilibrium hath been upset through the vibrating influence of this most great, this new World Order. Mankind's ordered life hath been revolutionized through the agency of this unique, this wondrous system, the like of which mortal eyes have never witnessed."

"The principle of the oneness of mankind—the pivot round which all the Teachings of Baha'u'llah revolve—is no mere outburst of ignorant emotionalism or an enunciation of an ideal, but stands inseparably associated with an institution adequate to embody its truth, demonstrate its validity, and perpetuate its influence. It implies an organic change in the structure of present day society, a change such as the world has not yet experienced."

All quotes from the Writings of the Baha'i Faith.

—Submitted by the Association for Baha'i Studies at UNB.

PEARCE: NOBLE BUT UNREALISTIC

In response to Frank Pearce's article of last week:

It was with great interest that I read your article in last Friday's Brunswickan. At first I was amused by your solution's for Canada's trade ills ("The country of Canada needs to close its borders to trade..."), but the further I read I realised this was a serious article expressing a serious opinion. Well I have some serious questions of my own:

1) Assuming that the international community would essentially 'blackball' Canada if it was to close its borders to trade from other nations (i.e. they would then refuse to trade with us)—what do we do with the hundreds of thousands of Canadians whose jobs are export-dependent? Simple answers like "well, they would just supply the Canadian market" don't make any sense because many large export-driven industries like forestry and telecommunications cannot exist at their present levels without export trade—the Canadian market is just not large enough. Result: they would be out of work.

2) Given that products from other nations would stop flowing into Canada under your plan—shall we: a) go without those products—sacrificing our standard of living for the sake of our 'no trade' principles; or b) create all of those industries in Canada from scratch. Judging from your article where you state "I cannot think of a single mass produced product which cannot be manufactured using the resources found exclusively within the borders of Canada" I assume you would choose (b).

Question: where will the money come from to start all of the industries that don't exist in Canada in any substantial form (ex. consumer electronics, heavy machinery and equipment, etc.)—the government? Shall they be state-owned and operated? or shall we allow entrepreneurs to start them? One way or the other the result would be incredibly expensive and shoddy goods (since there would be no real economies of scale in such a limited market place, or the competition necessary to ensure the variety and quality of goods to which we are now accustomed).

3) Likewise your suggestions for solving questions of energy raise questions:

where will the billions of dollars come from to harness the Fundy tides, and to find alternate sources of energy? A noble endeavour indeed, but like the rest of your solutions the incredible outlays of money and manpower necessary make them almost impossible in the short term, or even the foreseeable long-term. Also, will we as consumers be able to afford the vastly increased prices for these energy sources? or will that too have to be subsidised by government (paid for by increased taxes of course).

4) You state: "However, the subsidies given to agriculture and other industries are not nearly so important as the subsidies given to the people of Canada..." [does anyone] want to risk losing these subsidies? Is this what now defines being Canadian—one dependent on subsidies? Not for me, nor, I assume, for the majority of other Canadians. How incompetent, skillless, and lacklustre do you think Canadians are?

The results of no-trade/Canada-only policy are not only economically bankrupt, but morally wrong. We are doing no favours to the poor of this world if we cannot allow them the chance to develop their own economies by trading with a rich nation such as our own. Countries such as Japan, Korea, Germany, Singapore, etc. could never have gone from their terrible conditions after the Second World War, to where they are today without the chance to export to other nations. They, too, were destitute, poor, but with foreign markets open to them they were allowed the opportunity to improve their lot in life. The same will eventually hold true for a country like Mexico—there are no easy short term solutions, only hard work coupled with the opportunity to trade with others.

I understand the concerns of many about the environment and jobs - however the solution is not to turn our back on the rest of the world and assume we can maintain our present standard of living. We can't. Your article was filled with the usual "I'm only a Canadian" insecurities which always seem to conclude Canada is incapable of competing with the rest of the world. You are wrong: this nation has built itself up to where it is today by hard work, fair social policies, and freedom—especially the freedom to involve in commerce and trade.

—Sincerely, Chris Gatto

BLOOD N THUNDER ON BLOOD N THUNDER

My letter in Blood n Thunder (*Brun* 17 Feb 95), was unfortunately modified by your typists/proofreaders (assuming you have proofreaders).

The letter was clearly addressed to Georgina Basset, not the editor or the *Brun*. I have written other letters addressed to people other than the editor (ie. Liz Lautard) and this has, in the past, been transcribed. If this is no longer your policy, please let me know and I will take that into account when I write the body of the letter.

My use of "feministic" was an ironic shot at Ms. Basset's use of the same non-word in her letter last week. If you didn't correct her misspelling, you shouldn't have corrected mine.

The omission of a zero on the prize for the contest (which I stated correctly) makes it look like I don't know what I'm talking about (also makes it seem that women are worth less money than they actually are).

There were less spelling mistakes than usual, but still.

When my name is on something, I like it to be as good as it can be. It annoys me when I give you something I've written, correctly, and you mess it up. If there is any ambiguity about what I've written, someone should call me. I assume that's why you ask for the phone number at the bottom of the submission. On a more positive note, I really liked the title you put on the letter. Thanks for the forum.

Julie Broczkowski

Blood n' Thunder
continued on next page