

BLOOD & 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, Student Union Building. Deadline: 5 p.m. Tuesdays. Maximum length: 300 words.

The Fallacy of the PC Movement

The time has come to set texts aside and address an issue which has caught the attention and raised the ire of many on our campus and, indeed, across our continent, an issue which has felt much heat, but received altogether insufficient light. I am referring to the censorship of racism, sexism, and the other prejudices with which the PC movement is concerned.

At the core of the debate is a question over what our rights should and should not include. For purposes of discussion, I classify the problem under four simple questions:

1) Does an individual have the right to express the opinions or values he or she chooses? In other words, should we have freedom of thought? If so, then to what degree?

2) Does an individual have the right to express the opinions/values he or she holds? In other words, should we have freedom of expression? If so, then to what degree?

3) Does an individual have the right to act on the opinions/values he or she holds? In other words, should we have freedom of behaviour? If so, then again, to what degree?

4) Does an individual have the right to enforce the opinion/values he or she holds? Should one person be able to force others to think, speak, or act in conformity with his or her beliefs?

To apply all of this to the issue at hand, the questions become: Does one have the right to hold, express, act on, and enforce his or her version of non-prejudicial views? The last question is key to the issue, for those who enforce political correctness apparently believe that when they think it justified, they have the right to punish and discriminate against the 'politically incorrect', and to force them to change their views. In doing this, the politically correct deprive their ideological foes of lower level rights such as freedom of thought and expression? Should the PC have more fundamental human rights than their perceived bigot? Apparently, they think so, but I disagree. In the name of consistency, should not their rights be equal? Those who adhere to the politically correct doctrine, good motives aside, are assuming a position to which they have no legitimate claim. The fair-minded individual has no more right to force his or her views on others.

In the *Opinion* column of November 22, Tony Johnson Tracy wrote "Bush and other anti-PC crusaders intend to return the universities to an era of stultifying conformity..." Isn't it clear that the politically correct, in punishing those who disagree with their views, are themselves enforcing conformity? This looks suspiciously like a double standard. The inconsistency in the PC movement is obvious. Forced tolerance is intolerance toward the intolerant. In their assumed role of judge, jury, and executioner, the politically correct become participants in the intolerance which they profess to hate.

In conclusion, this is clear. Wherever one draws the line on individual freedom, the same rights must apply to everybody. The PC movement fails at this point when it denies a

bigot the right to freedom of thought and speech, while claiming these rights and more (freedom of action and enforcement) for itself.

Nathanael Kuehner

Dearest Bill

We would hate to disappoint our biggest fan; so you can consider this our official call for your expulsion.

UNB Student Wimmim's Collective

Comic Strip Promotes Violence

This is a reply to a letter written by Bill MacGillivray to the Women's Collective (Brunswickan Nov. 29/91). I have a hard time understanding how Mr. MacGillivray can justify his point of view regarding the comic-strip in question. First of all, it does promote violence, and second of all, the Aquinian should have screened this material before it was printed. If they did then they are as much as (sic) fault as Mr. MacGillivray is. You must remember Mr. MacGillivray that freedom of the press and artistic expression, means that one has a responsibility for one's actions. It is obvious that you cannot except (sic) this regards your letter. People have the right to question irresponsibility or adverse points of view, and the Women's Collective point of view is a valid one. Your dogmatic reply only shows that you lack understanding on the issue of violence, but more important is your lack of sensitivity in this matter. I find this very disturbing. Even more disturbing, correct me if I'm wrong, I read some real sense of frustration and anger towards women; because you cannot accept the criticism made by the Women's Collective. Your letter seems to dismiss their ideas completely making them invalid or non-existent (sic). Let me tell you something Mr. MacGillivray. I have an 8.5 year old daughter, and I treasure the close relationship we have. We talk about a lot of things, especially about her education and her willingness to become a vet. The one thing important to both of us, is that she should never have to put up with any type of physical or mental abuse.

Yes Mr. MacGillivray your comic strip does promote violence and hatred, whether it be towards oneself or towards men, women or children. It is morally wrong to defend this type of position. I think that you will find that more and more men are no longer supporting this male stereotype. They are becoming more aware that violence is not a means to an end, and that it can no longer be justified or tolerated.

William Parker
Audio-Visual Services, UNB

Write for More Than a Good Laugh

In recent weeks we have read the Wimmin's Room with, generally,

much amusement. However, the latest column has gone to the point where we feel compelled to comment.

It is obvious to anyone of reasonable intelligence that Genesis is not a literal account of creation. It is meant, like the other parables in the Bible, to teach people something. The writers of the Wimmin's Room have shown incredible ignorance in their column of Nov. 29. They have made light of a part of the Bible which to many people is sacred. They have perverted a parable about the loss of innocence and the gain of knowledge into completely biased, stereotypically feminist rhetoric. If the purpose of this column is to promote awareness of feminist issues why do the writers of the Wimmin's Room insist on perpetuation of the popular conception of the feminist as a radical, reactionary woman? Why do they not address feminist issues? While personal stories of abuse and survival are inspiring to both men and women, they don't convey any information on how people on this campus and everywhere can improve the situation of women.

For a group of "enlightened" women, these writers have done a thorough job of offending and insulting people who revere the Bible's teachings. If the writers of the Wimmin's Room want to accomplish anything, they should try more action and less rhetoric. They should stop viewing themselves as ultimately persecuted and write something meaningful. Maybe then people will read the Wimmin's Room for more than "just a good laugh".

Jeff Czopor
Elise Craft

Blaming Religion: What's your point?

I just happened to come across the Wimmin's Room last week to find the worst piece of hypocrisy I've seen this year. Don't get me wrong; victim blaming very much so exists in society today, but I am referring to another kind of criticism that is often overlooked; religion blaming.

I would first like to point out a few things that contradict what many people believe:

1) The Bible was NOT written by the prominent men in the society that existed at the time. It was inspired by The Almighty God to both men and women.

2) The Bible was not written in a male point of view. There are many examples of prominent women, such as Rahab and Deborah. Some books, such as Ruth, were inspired by women.

3) Genesis, where the story of Adam and Eve is found, was written in an omniscient point of view, and NOT from a male perspective.

I would also like to comment on some quotes made in the Wimmin's Room:

1) "Let's try to imagine Eve's side of the story." When something is written in an unbiased point of view, why should it be made biased?

2) "...in Garden of Eden, both Adam and Eve were growing bored..." How could anyone who was given everything become bored?

3) "...she [Eve] had been raised to obey..." Eve was Adam's companion, not his servant.

4) "Perhaps the Lord is more just than I first thought." Who is anyone to judge the Lord?

I believe that everyone has the right to their opinion. However, it is not right to draw criticism based on poor knowledge and understanding. The mysteries of God and the wisdoms in His books will never be fully understood.

The subject that was chosen for last week's Wimmin's Room certainly showed a lack of respect for the religious beliefs that many people have. The rewrite of Genesis in the article portrayed values that do not exist in the original story. This was indeed a very poor attempt to turn people's attention towards women's issues. To the writer of the Wimmin's Room: Who are you to criticize the words of God?

Eric Toner

Know Your Rights!

It seems like you can't open the Bruns' anymore without reading a whiny letter or editorial. Week after week, in The Wimmin's Room, The Black Triangle, and Positively Pink, we are faced with the complaints of a disgruntled and angry sect of students decrying the abuse of their rights. It seems odd to me that no-one has yet taken aim against the greatest opponents of basic human rights on campus: I'm not talking about sexist professors, Evil Cartoon Artists, or inebriated Engineers in the Red n' Black; rather I am speaking of those who subscribe to the Politically Correct philosophy.

I guess the odd thing is that these people genuinely seem to believe that they are for individual freedoms, though they routinely call for limitations on the rights of many. For instance, they wail ceaselessly and loudly that women have no voice (whatever that means), and are ignored in courses on history and literature. They therefore demand a forum for their grievances, and cite freedom of the press as a justification for threatening to slander our professors. At the same time, they demand that the student press censor or ignore the views of those who (sic) ideas they find repugnant. I really don't think I will be able to sway their blind conviction on this matter, but I have to point out that they are at every turn contradicting themselves in the arena of human rights. I'll elaborate.

As Canadians, we are all guaranteed a number of fundamental freedoms. I won't reprint the charter, but among these are the rights to freedom of opinion, belief, and expression. Furthermore, as citizens of the Earth, we are all guaranteed the right of freedom of expression, including the right to hold opinion without interference. This right comes from The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 19, and is set without limitations.

What this boils down to is the following: everyone has the right to think and say what they want; everyone has the right to do so without interference or reprisal; this right is granted to everyone not just women and minorities. Isn't that nice? How

free we are! Well, not quite. See, unfortunately, just because we are guaranteed these rights doesn't really mean we have them. This is largely because of human nature; people don't really like to read the views of people who subscribe to a different philosophy. In reality, most people want unlimited freedom of expression for their own opinions, and seek to limit this right when it comes to other people. Thus, a neo-Nazi cites freedom of opinion for his views, but limits the rights of gay's by using terms like "obscenity violations." This is hypocrisy. The mistake our politically correct friends make is in thinking that they are any better just because they are on the side of the groups who have been hard done by in the past. Not true. They are just like any other bigots: they believe that women, gays, and minorities should be allowed to say and think whatever they want, but try to set limits on what others feel by employing words like "oppressive", "sexist", "racist" and "patriarchy", terms that are the moral equivalent of "obscene", "communist" and left-wing, and which are often used in a similar fashion.

I will, no doubt uselessly, point out that nothing that I have said in the above article puts down women, homosexuals, or minorities, so please don't write in accusing me of doing so. All I have done is point out the double-standard inherent in advocating freedom of thought for one group at the expense of another. I personally wish that everyone had the right to think and say what they want, without worrying about censorship, or worse, reprisals. Unfortunately, it seems that Joe Strummer had the most astute insight on the whole matter when he said: "You have the right to free speech... as long as... you aren't dumb enough to actually try it!"

Bill MacGillivray

THE
Chestnut
440 York St. PUB

Saturday Breakfast
Bacon or Ham
2 Eggs
Home fries
& Toast
\$2.45 plus tax
10am - 3pm

every
Saturday
afternoon
at 3:30pm

**POOL
TOURNAMENTS**

Meet Your Friends at the
CHESTNUT PUB