

# Blood and Thunder

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Rm. 35, Student Union Building, UNB Campus  
DEADLINE: 5 p.m. Tuesday

### Carry on our wayward son

Dear Editor:

Unless I am satisfied, along with my colleagues -- the professors and students of the Department of Anthropology -- that our proposed new quarters are as appropriate to our academic purposes as our present ones, *I will not move nor will I be moved* from my office or Annex "C" by anything short of physical force or a magistrate's bench order.

I remember much from the "sixties", certainly. I remember aspects of my youthful and flamboyant

political activities. I have become placid and conservative, but like a horse sniffing the scent of a familiar racetrack where once he ran and won many races my old mind suddenly feels young again; and I remember what in study groups I once taught to eager activists -- the S.D.S. techniques of passive resistance and protest (and, of course, their delicate, deliberate, step-by-step escalation).

Any plan to remove without our consent the Department of Anthropology from Annex "C" should include a budget for the special-duty policemen who will be needed:

1. to carry me bodily (yelling vulgarities at the top of my voice) out of my office; and

2. to chase me (with, perhaps, a net) as I scamper back to my office from wherever I have been put.

Anthropology students may decide their interests are threatened; therefore, more special-duty policemen will be needed.

3. to pick up and remove bodily (along with cook-stoves and sleeping bags) the students who will have occupied Annex "C"; and

4. with yet more nets, to capture these students as they scamper back to re-occupy the building.

It may be that more than merely the anthropology students will become involved; and more special-duty policemen will be needed:

5. to break apart the linked-arms human chains with which these other students will encircle and protect the building; and

6. to carry each human link from Annex "C"; and

7. to chase and recapture these students as they seek to re-form their protective circle (a very big net for this, I believe).

It should be noted that many special-duty policemen will be needed, because,

- a) within reach of my rhetoric in any typical week are at least 700 students; and
- b) although many of these are "uncommitted", many enjoy a "lark" (more so when there are hot dogs and baked beans -- an old S.D.S. courtesy); and
- c) my colleague professors and their students may join these gestures of passive resistance and protest.

As Don Marquis had Mehitabel tell Archie, "There's a dance in the old girl yet!" -- and, wheeeeeee! by golly, I even feel my teeth growing back in!

Sincerely,

Charles Ackerman  
Department of Anthropology

**Bennett  
no scoundrel**

Sir:

I was surprised to read the February 15 *Brunswickan* editorial entitled "What if you gave a debate...And nobody came?" The author stated that "The people in a position to answer these and any other questions did not show up." My name was included with Burgess and Fox as a scoundrel who would not discuss SUB issues.

After reading the editorial, I

immediately wondered what debate the author was referring to. I found the answer to this enigma in the February 8 *Brunswickan*. The last paragraph in an editorial on page 8 *Brunswickan*. "For all those who wish to voice their objections come to the 'Subterranean Debate' in the Blue Lounge at 2:30."

Thus, without any advance notice or publicity, the author expected me to attend a debate that was announced in one sentence in the middle of a paper that came out a few hours before the event.

In addition, even if I had known about the event I could not have attended as I have a laboratory each Friday at 2:30. Of course, I would have been willing to send written comments or a member of my Commission to represent my views.

However, I received no invitation to do so. No message was left at the Student Union Office for me--no personal contact was made.

Accordingly, I resent being told that I don't care about the Student Union Building simply because I was unable to attend a poorly publicized debate. I resent being condemned in an editorial without being asked by any of your reporters as to why I didn't attend.

I am deeply concerned about the SUB and who controls it. It was I who introduced a motion at the January 28 meeting of council which read: "Resolved that the UNB Student Union Council condemn and utterly reject the report of the Board of Governors on the future administrative structure of the SUB. Further, that Council refuses to appoint any student to positions on such an emaciated board."

Of course, *The Brunswickan* never asked me about this.

It was I who publicly asked Dr. Downey at the February 5 meeting of the Senate to set up a committee to resolve the differences between students and the administration on SUB operations. I asked whether he would renegotiate the terms of reference of the new SUB Advisory Board since Student Council will not send representatives to that Board as long as it lacks any real power. Downey refused.

In conclusion, I ask that *The Brunswickan* not condemn me for inaction when the inaction was not on my part.

Sincerely,  
Michael Bennett  
VP Academic  
UNB Student Union

**Liberals in a  
sorry state**

Dear Editor:

As the participants in last

Monday's disarmament debate sponsored by WORD,; we were extremely disappointed by the lack of interest and credibility of the campus Liberal parties. The debate was meant to inform the student population of the parties' policies concerning this topic, and they, on numerous occasions saying that they would send a representative, refused to do so. This shows that the Liberal party has no respect for the Canadian peace movement and its bearing on Canadian society.

The Liberal party, when losing the election last September vowed to rebuild the party and its policies. If this is an indication of reformed Liberal policy and dedication to the people of Canada, then the Liberal party is indeed in a sorry state.

We, as the representative of the New Democratic and Progressive Conservative parties, felt an obligation to inform the student body of our policies concerning the arms race. The Liberals obviously don't share in our obligation to the student body of this campus, or the Canadian people as a whole.

We regret the position that the Liberal party took.

Kevin O'Donnell, NDP  
Randy Maillet, PC

### Correction

Editor:

Please correct my letter, "Student Politics Trivial," in March 15's issue. The fourth paragraph should read:

The above points have top priority as they are, I feel, important. I would like to see the G.S.A. executive getting involved with other matters. It should be made clear, however, that the executive needs more help, more input and more participation from the students. I am perfectly willing and open to receive new ideas or suggestions which any group might have, provided people are willing to assist in carrying them out.

David Wallace  
G.S.A. President

### Blood 'n' Thunder policy

All letters to the editor must be double-spaced on one side of the paper. They must include the author's name, student number, and phone number. We will withhold names on request and let you use a pseudonym.

As a matter of policy, we will not print letters that are libellous, distasteful, encourage criminal acts or that are racist, sexist, or homophobic in nature.

Letters should be of a reasonable length (300 words, please) and may be edited for grammar, clarity, and length.

本會中華文化晚會海報其中之  
會字乃會之誤屬書者之疏忽簡  
鄙謬誤之處懇請各界原諒  
華裔同學委員會

道歉啓示