

# BLOOD AND THUNDER

Continued from page 18

beret vietnam vets, who by the way are wanted in the U.S for shooting down a national guard helicopter. Here is another much overlooked fact, the barricades and roadblocks were illegal. Much of the armament the Indians had was illegal, as were the night flights of a Cessna Aircraft into and out of Oka. It seems that a few of the Indians spent much of the Oka crisis a little intoxicated. I have nothing against getting drunk but you won't see me drinking and handling a gun. Speaking of guns, the Indians at Oka were armed with every thing from semiautomatic rifles to .50 caliber machine guns of M72 rocket launchers, and who knows what was shipped out on those night time cessa flights. People have complained of trampled rights, well I hate to be one to point this out but, the governments night-time search and seizures of weapons caches were quite legal. Probably cause and all that. As to the war measures act, if you follow the news it was revoked a few years back and was replaced with something not pertinent (sic) to the situation. Yet another point, the tanks at Oka, there were only four of them, and they were not, to my knowledge given any 105 mm rounds. In fact they were sent to intimidate. In situations such as Oka its better to scare someone away than to blow them away. So, in summary, we had at Oka; a greedy Mayor, I mean trying to turn Indian land into a golf course is not very nice; our native people, acting beligerantly (sic) towards the army; and of course we have the Canadian Armed Forces trying to restore law and order, without (sic) provoking a gunfight. You have but to see the live footage from Oka to see this. Anyone who believes the weapons seizures was an attempt at provocation is obviously not cognizant of the facts, the weapons were seized in order to protect the army, and the citizenry at Oka. After all, you can't have a gunfight without any guns.

In the final analysis two wrongs do not make a right, and it is never smart to take up arms against the government. The army was sent in to restore law and order, not to repress the native people. That was the real issue at Oka, the disruption of law and order. If any other group of organization had set up roadblocks, how long do you think they would have lasted? What the Mayor of Oka did was wrong but what the Mohawk warriors did was illegal, there is a difference. So in the future, let's make litigation not war.

Andrew Holt

## Nick and the Rocky Horror Show

Dear Sir,

This letter is in reference to the letter submitted last week by one

called Nicolas Oliver. Having attended the Rocky Horror Picture Show, I feel Mr. Oliver's accusations need some clarification as they are totally biased.

I arrived in the vestibule of Tilley Hall on the evening in question to notice Mr. Oliver congregating himself alongside of groups of obnoxious idiots. Mr. Oliver seemed to know them well. When Jason Burns (VP Activities) got up to make an announcement concerning the film, he was barely missed by a water balloon. My question to student council and everybody involved, "Why was there not mentioned at this time what was to be allowed and what not allowed to be brought in."

At the door going in to the Theatre, Campus Police made no effort to stop eggs, fish, rice and water balloons from being brought. I ask the student population, was there not a breach of trust and duty committed here by the student police? I most certainly think so.

Now Mr. Oliver we are finally getting to you. Your language was obscene and very offensive. I rather enjoyed watching the melee of things being thrown because after 5 minutes, your language became boring. And weren't you asking members of the audience sitting around you for things to throw?

Yes folks, damage was done. But certain individuals cannot be singled out solely for all damage done on October 31. The student union campus police, Dean of Act, all members of the audience and yes, you Mr. Oliver all contributed to the so called damage done in T102.

Dave Carter

## Diversity in the struggle

Terry Richards,

Before I begin responding to your accusation and criticism, I would first like to acknowledge that you did raise many fine points in your column of Nov. 30. It is unfortunate, however, that any validity those comments may have had are drowned out by the venting of your personal frustrations, which results in a lack of both integrity and professionalism.

Your distortion of the facts is appalling; first, there are only 24 hours to a day, not 51, which is exactly how much 'notice' you had to appear on our show. It leads me to wonder how much time you need to prepare a defence of your column.

Second, the invitation to appear on the show was for 'anytime', and not specifically for the show of Nov. 26 - show for which you were not required, as it was meant to solicit the opinions of those with a far vaster knowledge of the media then either of us (Kwame Dawes and Steve Staples). The intent was to discuss the media in general, not The Bruns specifically.

Your attack of James Gill is not only unfounded, but clearly displays your hypocrisy. You claim that he has "no basis for his views", and that he lacks courage. I would submit to you sir that had it not been for Mr. Gill's courage, neither you nor I would be involved in the politics that we are today. Simply put, it takes a lot more guts to start something from scratch then (sic) it does to simply carry it on.

As to his views, I would dare say that Mr. Gill is far more informed of the gay rights movement then (sic) yourself (hell, my straight friends are); a knowledge that was reflected in the quality of his column.

You claim that there is some implicit understanding that gay people 'stick together', watching out for each other. Perhaps if you spent more time reading the plentiful gay media, instead of the gay fiction you are so fond of quoting, you would realize just how naive a statement that was. Gay people are the most diverse minority group there is, covering every part of the political, economic and social spectrum, originating from every creed and nationality. Because of this, and not unlike other minority and/or rights movements (women, natives, blacks, ad infinitum), there is a diversity of opinion as to how to get the job done. Conflicts arise, based on various interpretations of the facts, hence resulting in a lack of cohesion within the group.

All in all, you seem to find it a facile argument when you are fighting for the right to exist, but when somebody criticizes the content of your column, instead of its presence, you take it personally. I have admired your conviction and courage in writing the column over the past months, but it takes more then (sic) that; it takes a very thick skin. The lack of rationality in your last article demonstrates to me that you lack this quality.

You have espoused the noble goal of 'binding together' Mr. Richards, a mark that you yourself have missed. The end result is an article that only serves to destroy the otherwise fine job that you have done. And in your equating of James Gill with Steve Goble, you have written the kind of article that makes me ashamed of being associated with the likes of you.

James Savoie

## Another tough lesson to learn

Dear Editor,

With regards to Mr. Richard's column "Gay Forum" in the last week "Brunns" dealing with community solidarity. I fully realize that comparisons are invidious, but it was inevitable that "Gay Forum" would be perceived as the successor, if not the "son of In the Pink", and comparisons were sure to follow. Both James Gill and yourself ran, and run, the risk of being seen

as self-appointed spokespersons for the community. While a gay and lesbian community surely exists in this town, and I feel few of its members would question either James Gill's, or your personal courage, integrity or motives in taking such a public stand, you must realize that the means by which "the cause" is pursued will always be controversial. The reason is quite simple. Other than the shared goal of legal equality, our personal goals are very diverse.

James Gill took great pains to ensure that "In the Pink" remained a column of personal opinion by a gay man: even to the extent of distancing himself from GALA, an organization he was instrumental in establishing on campus. His experience in activism informed his writing, but it remained an opinion, not a manifesto.

The most valuable service any of us can perform for our community is to stand up and be counted, but in doing so, we must develop thick skins, learn how to duck, and unfortunately, develop eyes in the back of our heads (such is politics). Criticism from our own ranks, no matter how well intended, can be hard to take, but while you confuse "solidarity" with "homogeneity", you had better get used to it. You cannot advocate diversity in society at large, and demand conformity in the gay and lesbian community. We are not sheep and you are not a shepherd.

I do not question your personal courage or your commitment, but I do question your judgement in making a person dispute into a public spectacle. It serves no-one's purpose or interests, least of all your own. Its unfortunate you are having to learn a hard lesson in public eye, but remember, that which does not destroy us makes us stronger.

Adrian Park

## Lest we forget

To the Editor:

Lest we forget December 6th. One year ago, yesterday, 14 women were brutally murdered by a man who hated feminists. Lest we forget, as the tension rages in the Persian Gulf, women are being raped, beaten and murdered in Kuwait (and people tell me the war hasn't started yet!). Lest we forget, in 1990, 86-90 women will have been killed at the hands of their husbands, lovers or boyfriends. Lest we forget, 70-73 women will be raped today in Canada, one in every four wives will be battered in some way this week, and someone's child is right this minute being sexually abused by an adult male. There is a full scale war against women in our society.

Last weekend a man stood up during a Montreal debate and yelled about feminist being responsible

for Marc Lepines actions. "They should all be assassinated" he said. What does he mean, should be, women are assassinated daily. We are being raped, beaten, assaulted, and murdered daily. And we are being held responsible for our fate at the hands of violent men.

I'm a feminist. And I will fight for equality and continue to attempt to stop the violence against women. God forbid that I should die because I want a life where I feel safe. December 6th, 1989 - Lest we forget!

A. Glencross

## B & T's

Dear Editor,

In last week's newspaper you stated, "I anticipate that the views expressed in this editorial will spur many a writer to respond through a letter." For me, this was indeed the case. While I find that I agree with your views on the role Blood and Thunder plays in *The Brunswickan*, I feel inclined to add one more requirement to your list of criteria used in selecting letters for print. In my opinion, this section is misused when writers are allowed to hide behind pseudonyms to mask their true identity.

Of course, I realize that it is some times necessary for the identities of writers to remain a secret to the general public. Otherwise, wrongs would never be unearthed because individuals would not be willing to expose themselves to harm which, in some cases, would result. Still, my use of the word "harm" is not meant to be all-encompassing.

In my opinion, harm would include the threat of a lost job, a low mark, or physical abuse. While my list does not cover all possibilities, my point is that individuals must not be able to use anonymity to defend against social harm. I should not be able to write that Kwame Dawes is an incompetent Editor-in-chief and then be able to remain anonymous to avoid having regular readers think I am silly.

It seems to be the norm in this, and most, papers that an individual attacks another, but the attacker refuses to have his or her name printed. Surprisingly, this practice was not very prevalent in your last issue. Still, it did occur in one letter. In this letter, "A Curious Cat" appeared to make a dig at Matt Harris and the Social Club Board of Directors. Now I do not know Matt Harris or any of the directors, but why should the Cat be able to place their characters in the public view without doing the same with his/her own. In past issues, I have seen individuals make much more viscous attacks on others' characters without signing their names.

In closing, with a very few exceptions, every writer should be forced to have his/her name printed. If these writers do not have the common decency to allow their names to stand, then common decency should dictate that their letters not be printed.

Kevin Kiley.