

## EDITORIAL-WUMP

Christmas Wish List 1994

As Canada Post screwed up in delivering peoples letters to Santa Claus (Imagine that), we decided to publish them in the hope that with the aid of some Christmas miracle Santa will get his subscription in time to make their dreams come true.

**Robin Armstrong-** A Christmas goose. (See UNB sexual harassment policy)  
**Mrs Armstrong-** For that young man across the way to stop going through her garbage with a knife and fork in his hungry hands.  
**Tom Traves-** A controversy at Dal involving assistant mathematics professors.  
**Frank Wilson-** A job at a university that actually does research.  
**James O'Sullivan-** To be allowed to use John Bosnitch's accounting methods.  
**Paul Estabrooks-** A vaseline-free substitute for his hair and enough interest in his own affairs to keep his nose out of everybody else's.  
**Pat Fitzpatrick-** A job as Frank McKenna's public relations director to Maclean's magazine.  
**Lara Rooke-** A boyfriend who is bigger than "this big" (not a fish story).  
**Luc Pinet-** Full honoraria even for those three weeks he was in sunny California.  
**Chris Alward-** A new paint job for his Tickle Trunk.  
**Chantel Walker-** A pair of those nice safe baby scissors that you couldn't even cut wet paper with and a set of those flowered, no-skid, bathtub stickers.  
**Daryl Kent-** A Jerry Garcia tie and Jerry Garcia's funky brown and yellow underwear. *We think it's tie dyed.*  
**Barb Kirk-** A plaid door to make Mark Morgan jealous.  
**Marlene O'Neil-** For the foundation to hire another employee named Marlene. *To avoid confusion.*  
**Marlene Brewer-** For people to stop calling her Marlene when they mean Marlene.  
**Glenna Bell-** An inflatable Elvis.  
**Chantal Albert-** To be able to show the movies advertised in Bruns Dirty Bits.  
**Lisa Lane-** One bourbon, one scotch and one beer.  
**Dave Erb-** For Steve Seabrook to buy him a Blue.  
**Yearbook-** A Yearbook  
**Kim Norris-** To get his key back from Mark.  
**Judy Mackay-** A title fitting her work. How about SUB Director?  
**Alastair Johnstone-** A Student Union Council Fan Club membership. So he can receive complementary vaseline-free hair care products.  
**Mark Morgan-** Worms. Great big honkin' worms to flavour the rice.  
**Janice McConnell-** All seven of the words that you can't say in print, all in a box, to be used at her leisure.  
**Mary Rogal-Black-** Some healthy green veggies and bran because as an English student all she needs is a nice healthy colon, or at least a semicolon.  
**René Ross-** Fuzzy pink bunny slippers. Because it's not nice to pick on someone with an owie. And a case of alcohol for the pain.  
**Bruce Denis-** A moment of time to contemplate how all that fuzz gathered in his navel.  
**Stacy Barton-** enough tequila to forget her LSATs  
**Pam Easton-** A by-line she can call her own.  
**Connie Corbett-** The chance to continue working at a real newspaper.  
**Carla Lam-** A chance to be the first to look at the promo CDs  
**Jethelo E. Cabilete-** Tickets to a play not quite so far off Broadway.  
**Maria Paisley-** A layout slave, a staff and a whip.  
**Kevin Johnston-** Scuba  
**Christina Hunter-** Two copies of the sexual harassment policy to give as gifts.  
**Mark Bray-** To stop having to work in the red light district without any gratification.  
**Paul Mysak-** A years supply of head and shoulders. A thimble full ought to do it.  
**Michael Edwards-** White dog shit and a pacifier in memory of his misspent youth.  
**Luke Peterson-** Uhm.. A computer layout course and a staff.  
**Bill Traer-** For people to pay their bills  
**Darlene Greenough-** Papers which are written in one of the known languages.  
**Tara Froning-** The peacekeepers to come home so her smile can stay.  
**Lisa Leblanc-** Someone to look down on.  
**Christine Lohr-** Enviroman to get his own section.  
**William Snowdon-** A spel cheker to be bilt into the compooters.  
**Gordon Loane-** Two scoops of stories in an SU council meeting.  
**Charlene Deyarmond-** The third scoop.  
**Jonathan Stone-** Elastic deadlines and slinky, see-through underoos (with feet).  
**Neil Duxbury-** Tinsel, a feather, a book of games and Cheryl.  
**Johanne Harvey-** Swimming  
**John Gallagher-** Cross Country  
**Sherry A. Morin-** A gift certificate for an Arthur Murray course in Techno dance styles.  
**Cheryl McLean-** Neil, a bow, a camera, and an editor with a sense of humour.  
**Andrew Sneddon-** A Bay City Rollers CD and a shotgun.  
**Kevin G. Porter-** Viewpoint (we know how much he loves it)  
**Marc Landry-** A world where people actually think skaters are cool.  
**Roxanne Robinson-** A maid for the darkroom.  
**Mike Dean-** A maid for the darkroom.  
**Kent Rainville-** Someone to explain that maid's outfit he got as a present.  
**Shane Heath-** A third board to sit on.  
**Mark Savoie-** A visit from one of the Clauses.  
**CHSR-** Mark Savoie.  
**Pillar-** A real story.  
**CHSC-** The mechanical bull from Travolta's first bomb, Urban Cowboy.  
**Cellar-** A big freakin' glittery disco ball from Saturday Night Fever.  
**Aquinian-** Al S. Tare, let them tremble in fear.  
**Fredericton City Police-** Velcro, nonslip, multilocking holsters. Just don't try to get the gun out in under five minutes.  
**To all our Profs-** Our personel fortunes, consisting of twelve shiny 1978 nickles, eleven Fred Flinstone forks, ten old exams, nine fancy cheat sheets, eight leftover eggos, seven moldy aspirin, six sinking grades, five failed courses, four beaver coffees, three onion rings, two grinding nerves, and a late . . . . .paaaaper

## Blood n' Thunder

Dear Editor,  
 December 1st has been recognized as Worlds AIDS Day. It is a chance for people in all corners of the globe to remember all of the people who have had their lives affected by AIDS.

This year Worlds AIDS Day has been designated for the families of AIDS sufferers. Family members are the ones that have to watch as their loved ones have their lives drastically altered when those individuals are faced with the AIDS virus. As a volunteer at AIDS-NB, I have seen the effort that has been put into the fight against this horrible disease. I feel that there is a great deal of support offered for the friends and family of AIDS victims. We, as a society, have to realize these people are going to suffer the loss of a loved one and we have a responsibility to offer our support to these family members.

As students in this modern society, we must take an active role in the fight against AIDS. It doesn't matter if you are straight, gay, black, white, male or female, this is something that is going to affect you at least once in your lifetime. It is our responsibility to get involved in some way, whether as a volunteer for your local AIDS Organization, as a supporter of fundraising activities, or by simply wearing a Red Ribbon to show your support of the fight against AIDS.

People should be at least aware of the dangers of AIDS. In the Oct. 7th issue of the Brunswickan, there was an article written by a student who has had their (sic) life affected by

AIDS. On events like Worlds AIDS Day, we should at least take a moment to remember and hope for these individuals as well. I hope that in the future students at this university will take an active role in the fight against AIDS.

Doug Saunders

Dear Editor,

I am disappointed to see that the debate over smoking at Maggie Jean has become personal. This notion has come to light given last weeks' letter by Mr. Lakoumentas entitled, "Smoke Gets in Their Eyes". His response to the letter "Non-Smokers Unite" was more of an attack on its author, Mr. Skeoch, than a rational response to the issue at hand. I have attempted to become more familiar with the smoking situation at the residence as I am myself a non-smoker. After viewing both sides of the issue, I would like to draw some conclusions and respond to Mr. Lakoumentas' rather vicious attack.

I would like to first address the contention that scientific research on the effects of smoking are flawed and that "irresponsible scientists" have tried to link smoking to lung cancer. There is one question that I would pose to Mr. Lakoumentas. Are there any rational redeeming qualities to smoking in terms of health? I find it hard to believe that there would be, both to the individual smoker and the person that has to inhale the second-hand smoke. Smoking is unhealthy to both the smoker and the person who

inhales the second-hand smoke. Any argument that proposes otherwise is very weak indeed.

The second major issue is the hypocrisy of the non-smoker. Mr. Lakoumentas made a personal attack on the advocates of non-smoking for being "hypocritical" by being seen at bars where smoking prevails. The issue is over smoking at the residence and not at the local drinking establishments. I would argue that a majority of students spend more time at home or at their residence than at the local bars, although there are a few exceptions. Regardless, a person holds their place of residence sacred and is entitled to a level of privacy. Inhaling second-hand smoke is a breach of that privacy.

In the end, the problem remains that smoking is allowed in all residences. The University of New Brunswick falls behind other universities by not providing "smoking" and "non-smoking" residences. I would propose that those who do not appreciate second-hand smoke have the option to live in a non-smoking residence, and those who want to inhale smoke have an option as well. This would resolve the problem with reasonable ease.

I am truly disappointed in Mr. Lakoumentas' personal attack on Mr. Skeoch. He could have added some intelligent dialogue to the debate, as some of my smoking friends have suggested. Instead, he had to resort to name-calling (i.e., "swine") to get his unreasonable point across.

Gary Fenn

## Opinion

By **Matin Yaqzan**, Retired member of the Department of Mathematics & Statistics, UNB

### Abortion

The literal meaning of abortion is 'giving birth to a fetus before it is viable', that is before it can survive outside a mother's womb. A human 'fetus' is the stage of development from three to nine months after conception. However, with new knowledge and new medical techniques, it is now possible to sustain life of a fetus outside a mother's womb, that would have been unthinkable in the past. Therefore, the past meaning of the word 'abortion' has changed, because a fetus removed from a mother's womb *can be* viable and can grow up to be a normal human being.

It seems that there have always been abortions, either because the mother's life was at stake, or a woman had conceived 'illegitimately' and wished to get rid of the consequence. However, in the past, both were relatively rare events. It would make the plot of a novel in which a girl becomes pregnant in a moment of passion and ends up leaving the town she lived in, or exposes herself to illicit and dangerous abortion. With the advancement of medical science, it is now rarely necessary to abort for saving the life of a mother, but the number of abortions performed because of undesired pregnancies has increased astronomically during the last thirty years. One can ask the question, why?

An obvious reason for an unusual increase in the number of abortions, for example, at least a million per year in the United States, is the fact that abortions have become simple and safe, as far as the woman is concerned. The other main reason is cultural, and is directly related to the advent of the 'pill' or other contraceptive devices that fail, and the birth of 'feminism', decline of the marriage system, and increase in promiscuity. The feminists advocate "equality" between men and women, and since giving birth and looking after babies, is one of the main stumbling blocks in achieving the feminist concept of "equality" with men, women are led to abort. Men do not become pregnant and do not have the same emotional attachment to children that women have, and do not have the same instinctive sense of responsibility to bring up children that women have.

### Right or Wrong?

The question of right or wrong about any act arises in the context of some basic axioms or beliefs, that must be upheld and respected. It is obvious that abortion would be 'right' in the eyes of a dedicated feminist, because her primary goal is to achieve "equality" with men, and anything that makes that ideal un-achievable, must be overcome. If, therefore, the feminist ideal is considered reasonable, beyond question, and must be achieved, then at worst, abortion may be considered a necessary evil. Of course, a feminist may not advocate abortion if the society were able to create circumstances that would enable her to compete with men in every sphere of life "equally". For example, once a baby is born, she would be equally responsible for its upbringing. The mother would have to spend no more time with her children than the father, so that she can pursue her 'career' and be able to make money, and be independent financially. And for the single mothers, who get pregnant through promiscuity, the society would either provide day-care and other facilities for the welfare of their children or provide free abortions.

### Meaningless Debate

The problem of right or wrong cannot be settled when people have very different basic axioms, beliefs and goals. For example, those who honestly believe that life, in particular, the human life, is very precious and is a gift from their God, who prohibits them from destroying it, cannot justify aborting a fetus that has the potential for survival. To them, abortion must be 'wrong'. There cannot be a meaningful debate between such people and those feminists who do not subscribe to such beliefs. No war of words can ever settle their differences. They cannot live in harmony with each other. They will always be at war, and it is unreasonable and unfair to force the opponents of abortion to pay for those who wish to abort. It is a negation of their religious freedom.

The only possible debate can be whether or not the removal of the umbilical cord should be the point of departure for the independent existence of a human being. The idea that a baby could not have independent existence as long as it was inside a mother's womb, was entirely correct in the past. Now that a fetus can survive outside a mother's womb, it is possible to justify treating a fetus as an individual on its own. Of course, it is a matter of societal values and attitudes. The idea that a baby immediately after the umbilical cord is removed, becomes an individual human being to be protected by society, and just before that it is entirely dependent upon the whims of its mother, is at best a matter of arbitrary judgement.

According to some, abortion is justified, because it saves the woman from "personal grief, physical trauma and risk, long-term financial hardship and/or the psychological pain of giving birth only to be forced into abandonment". If these can be considered as adequate reasons for a parent to kill a fetus, then it would be far more reasonable for a parent to end the life of a child who is born with such debilitating defects that not only the child has a life of misery and dependency ahead of it, the parents must also suffer with the child. The recent Latimer case in Western Canada is an example.

### Pain & Suffering

All living things tend to avoid pain. As human beings, we suffer when we have pain, and we suffer to see someone else in pain. This is in the background for much of the debate and rules and regulations about social values, right and wrong. A murder not only hurts the one being murdered, but also those who are close to him and are left behind to grieve over a long period of time. The killing of a fetus must hurt a fetus that already has the sensation of pain. Although the mother is the closest person to be hurt by killing of a fetus, it can also be hurtful to someone else who is aware of the incident. It would appear, therefore, that if an abortion must be performed for any reason at all, it should be done before the fetus has a sense of pain, and as privately as possible.

### "Justified" Killing

There can be little doubt or debate that aborting a fetus is murdering of a potential human being. However, our society does believe in justified killing, for example, in the name of a "war". When a high flying airplane drops a bomb, or when a rocket is fired to hit a target, it does not choose its victims by their names or on the basis of their actions. It murders mostly the innocent. Of 50 million people killed during the Second World War, and of the 200,000 killed in the current 'war' in Bosnia, the vast majority must have been that of innocent men, women and children. The leaders who initiated the 'war' in Bosnia, are still alive, and can justify their murders as essential for their higher goals of "ethnic cleansing", which is a misnomer for "religious cleansing". Those who perform abortions, are "killers" in the eyes of those who consider the viable fetuses as human beings, and, therefore, they can justifiably be at "war" with the killers.

### Courts & Contradictions

The concept of abiding by the law is being gradually extended, at least in the United States and Canada, to include almost every aspect of human life. The governments and the courts are encroaching imperceptibly over the realm of religious beliefs and an individual's private thoughts and feelings. On the one hand, they proclaim "religious freedom" for their citizens, and "separation of church and state", and on the other, they contradict themselves by legislating and enforcing laws that conflict with people's religious beliefs, and deny them the right to live according to those beliefs.

The God of the Old Testament, condemns homosexuality, and consequently many Jews and Christians must despise the practice and cannot possibly treat homosexuals with respect. They are bound by their religious beliefs to discriminate against such people, and yet they are now being condemned for doing so. There are those who honestly believe that the human life begins at conception, and the termination of that life is a sin, and yet laws are being enacted to force them to keep quiet and make them pay to help those who wish to commit the sin. Why should a person not carry on a struggle against what he believes is sinful, and even use physical force, if he is strong enough to win, as it is in the case of any "war"?

The feminist concept of "equality" with men is flawed and unnatural, and not all women aspire to be like men, and do what men do. Therefore, the unnecessary abortions performed to achieve the feminist ideal must be considered an abominable act.