

Blood and Thunder

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

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

History for Ross!

Mr. Frank McKenna
Premier of New Brunswick
Fredericton, N.B.

According to the reports in the media, Mr. Malcolm Ross, a teacher of English and Mathematics in Moncton, has written a book, *Spectre of Power*, in a religious vein, in which he asserts that (i) there is a world wide zionist conspiracy, and that (ii) the holocaust is an exaggeration. He has written 3 similar books in the past. Some Jewish people and others are up in arms, and you have declared publicly that you want Mr. Ross out of the class room.

I understand that the views expounded by Mr. Ross are not peculiar to him; there are other people in the United States, Canada and some other countries who subscribe to them. Therefore, Mr. Ross's books are not the only source of information and even if he were to be burned alive at stakes along with his books, such views will not disappear. There is no evidence that Mr. Ross is fomenting open hatred and civil disturbance. Nor is there any significant indication that he is misusing his position as a teacher to brainwash his students. Therefore, even if his views are completely erroneous, why is he not justified in expressing them, and why must lose his job as a teacher? As for the possibility that his writings might create hatred against the Jewish people, it is not much different from the kind of hatred that is permitted in our society in the name of freedom of religion, freedom of the press and the freedom of expression.

Most religious beliefs are based on the condemnation of those who disagree with those beliefs. If the Jewish faith were satisfactory to everyone, there would be no Christians. As a matter of fact, if Christ had not condemned the teachings of his own people, he might not have been crucified. Also, most Christians must believe that the followers of other religions, like Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Baha'ism, . . . , are all sinners and the only way to salvation is through the Christian faith. Of course, the other faiths may have their own disdain for Christianity. And different denominations in Christianity itself, have reasons to "hate" each other. But, obviously, as a society we are willing to tolerate this kind of hatred. The same is true in politics, where different parties may portray each other as evil, and it is justified as a necessary feature

of "democracy". Then why must you silence Mr. Ross? Why must he be deprived of his freedom of expression and speech? You have obviously used that very freedom to condemn him publicly, and have suggested a punishment without any formal charge, trial, examination of any evidence or conviction, and have created hatred against him in the minds of many. As a matter of fact, he has already been penalized. Is it fair and responsible for a person in your position to do so?

Your comments have legitimized the mob mentality that had prevailed before, and now it is taking the form of lynching. The school board is being asked to find some way to punish Mr. Ross. Mr. Noel Kinsella, who, as Human Rights Commissioner, is supposed to protect the human rights of Mr. Ross, now plans to go after him and find ways and means to silence him. To say the least, it is dishonest and shameful. Mrs. Shirley Dysart's comment that "teachers shape the attitudes of their students", and therefore, somehow it limits Mr. Ross's right to express his views even outside the class room, is patently absurd. This is tantamount to saying that a teacher who teaches Biology and the Theory of Evolution, would not express his belief in God even outside the class room. It is amazing that even the Teachers' Association has not come to Mr. Ross's aid. Mr. Malcolm MacLeod, the president, suggests that it's up to the Education Minister to move "against" Mr. Ross, which implies that Mr. Ross is guilty of doing something as a teacher which is improper. The idea that Mr. Ross's writings bring disrepute to the educational system is false, and as an argument to punish Mr. Ross, is an insult to human intelligence.

A rational and more humane approach would be to confront Mr. Malcolm Ross with facts and figures, if they exist, that would discount his claims. I have neither heard on the radio nor seen in the newspapers, any rebuttals to his charges, by any of his critics. If everyone is so sure that his charges are fallacious, why not ridicule them by making public the evidence against them, instead of hounding him? I do not know what exactly is meant by a world wide zionist conspiracy, but it is no secret that the Jewish people are extremely influential in world affairs. The United States is the most powerful country in the world and therefore, most influential, and the Jewish people wield immense power in the United States government, education, commerce, finance and the media, compared to their small population. And the same is true in Canada. Can anyone

deny that? Few political leaders, media commentators or newspapers can afford to displease them. Mr. Joe Clark is currently in hot water for simply saying that Israel has violated the human rights of the Palestinians, and Mr. Mulroney is forced to express his undying love for the state of Israel, on behalf of all Canadians, without saying as to what has Israel done for Canada to earn eternal gratitude of all Canadians?

As for the actual number of the Jewish people killed during the Second World War, it should not be impossible to establish with reasonable accuracy as to how many died in the gas chambers and how many might have been the victims of bombings or other atrocities during a war that killed a total of about 50 million people. As far as I am concerned, the cruelty of the act will not diminish if the number of people killed in the gas chambers turned out to be only six hundred thousand instead of six million.

I believe that Mr. Malcolm Ross, as a teacher of Mathematics, will accept logical conclusions and reasonable arguments. The threat of legal action on flimsy grounds, and depriving him of his job, will not benefit anyone, and the Jewish people might be the final losers in the long run.

Matin Yaqzan

Ban board

Dear Editor:

It seems that our Student Council is planning to push a Board of Directors on *the Brunswickan*. There has been no reasonable justification for this action. What content has appeared in *the Brunswickan* that has been libelous or has so offended the student body at large that it has made a Board of Directors necessary (sic) to control the paper's content?

Looking at the letters to the editor in *the Brunswickan* from the start of September (sic) to last week, the only complaints found were complaints about the word "babes" in a single cartoon and a complaint about the exclusive use of male pronouns in a single article. The rest of the letters were not concerned with complaints about the paper's content being offensive. Obviously, a Board of Directors is not needed to eliminate any libelous or offensive content in *the Brunswickan* because the editors have been doing a fine job on their own.

A Board of Directors will be a useless beurocratic (sic) burden

upon *the Brunswickan*. If certain members of the Student's council want to dictate content to the paper, they should run for editor. A Board of Directors would remove the editors' control of the content of the paper. This would produce a paper whose content was decided by a bickering bunch of busy-bodies as opposed to the solid group of present editors. "Too many cooks spoil the broth" is a saying which applies here.

The Brunswickan should be able to print stories on any situation in the world, including student politics, without worrying whether those same student politicians (sic) would allow the stories to be printed. The Student's Council should keep an arms length policy towards *the Brunswickan*.

There is no justification for the proposed Board of Directors. The Board, if installed, will only serve to sterilize what is now an exciting student publication. *The Brunswickan* should be able to print stories that are not slanted by the influence of the Student's Council. All students who care should write in to *the Brunswickan* or the Student's Council and express their support for *the Brunswickan* and a free press.

The Brunswickan is a progressive and exciting organ of student expression, not a dull tool of the Student's Council.

Brian Linkletter

Stormy Stay

Dear Editor:

I can't be certain whether or not your new "Editorial Censorship Board" will be in power before the next *Brun* but I am writing this letter in the sincere hope that it will not.

During my brief but stormy stay here at UNB I have witnessed the slow silent death of all that our student predecessors had worked for: everything from the SUB to the Student Union has passed from the control of the students to the administration. It now appears that student media will suffer the same fate.

To any outside observer, it would seem that the Student Governing Council (Larry Hansen et al.) wants to have its own little newsletter. Considering the fact that most of the meetings called by this group are in camera (ie., closed to the public) I don't see why a newsletter would be necessary.

I am certain that there are those of you who truly believe that the Jane Arnold gang just wants to guarantee (sic) non-sexist content and non-inflammatory news articles. Such a belief could only be described as naive. Having personally been witness to the methods employed by this group I find the statements made by Mr. James Gill, among others, to be nothing short of pure propaganda. Perhaps if Mr. Gill looked back on the origins of his student governing council (April 1986), he would not be so quick to defend its actions. After all, evil will breed evil.

The new Editorial Board should consider renaming *the Brunswickan* to something more appropriate - *Pravda* would do nicely.

Sincerely,
Anthony S. English

Brun petition

To the Editor and All Concerned:

It has come to our attention that *the Brun* is in serious danger of becoming another form of selective advertising.

The suggestion of creating a Board of Directors to monitor activities at *the Brun* is unnecessary. To date we have found nothing truly offensive to the extent that our intelligence and integrity are insulted. What does the Student Union hope to accomplish by expending their limited resources to inform us even less? Why is the Student Union being so secretive about their meetings when any student has the right to attend? Why was the investigative evidence of Karen Jean Braun's injustice destroyed when it could set precedence for any further complaints of sexual harassment? Are we going to have to wait until the next board comes in to see what happens? Won't that be too late?

The response of the student population to *the Brun* has increased over the last two years. Perhaps this is an example of the apathy Jane Arnold has noted

Continued on page 31