

# Blood and Thunder

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DEADLINE: TUESDAY 5 P.M.  
PLEASE SIGN ALL LETTERS

### S.U. Expansionism?

Dear Editor:

Although this letter may appear hostile, it is not intended to be. Moreover I cannot lay claim to representing all the views of my fellow graduates; thus, the views that follow are strictly mine.

Upon reading *The Brunswickan* (November 25, 1988), I was dismayed to learn that, according to S.U. President, Dean Frost, G.S.A. members waiting to re-join the S.U. A recent conversation with G.S.A. President Josephine Tan confirmed that nothing could be further from the truth. In my personal opinion, this idea is so unrealistic as scarcely to merit serious attention if not for the fact that this rather extreme proposition may receive wide attention among undergraduates, and lend them a false sense of authority of the S.U. over the G.S.A. Since such speculation is now in print, it must be vigorously opposed.

Few would be so bold as to assert that Mr. Frost intended to deceive the readership. I, for myself, certainly do not believe so and think, rather that his view stems from either a misunderstanding or a lack of familiarity with the recent history of the G.S.A. If the statement was not a misprint (and it could well be), then Mr. Frost displays a remarkably antedated outlook on the situation and, regardless of what he may have intended, should confine his remarks to an area in which he is competent. Were the statement accurately transposed, then it illustrates the basic need for the S.U. to censor its president.

This deceptively simple statement develops the idea that the G.S.A. and the S.U. are the same thing. They are not. They serve different purposes. Those familiar with the recent history of the G.S.A. will not be startled to learn that the birth of the Association was brought about in response to what was then seen as undue internal political turmoil and financial mismanagement within the S.U. Graduate interests were also largely ignored and the Association was therefore devised in response to a real need. The separation was a trying process; most particular tangles have more or less been sorted out but some persist in

current practise. Slowness recognizing the autonomy of a separating organization is, however, far from being unusual.

I find little reason at present to picture a return of the G.S.A. to the fold of the S.U. in the near future. To champion such an idea would be a futile endeavour since the S.U. has little to offer to graduates. The G.S.A. has found ready acceptance from the University Administration; it has its own I.D. card, collects its own fees and has representatives on several University committees. The evidence is overwhelming that the G.S.A. is not an evanescent phenomenon, but rather that it is firmly established and will flourish.

One's putative biases to one's side, I find it both a recurring irritation and a sobering fact that most undergraduates seem to consider the G.S.A. inferior, or irrelevant, to the S.U. After a slow start, the G.S.A. has begun to come of age and faces a transitional period. Its purview is still growing and, until recently, it was rather hesitant in its endeavours. Now it is full of vitality and should be considered an equal partner. Statements such as the one we are concerned with do immediate and direct harm to relations that still leave much to be desired between these organizations.

Without wanting to restart a very unpleasant and disruptive dispute, the overarching message I want to convey is that any resurgence of S.U. expansionism vis-a-vis the G.S.A. would, for all purposes, prove to be illadvised. If this is what Mr. Frost champions, then he shall learn that a return to S.U. is a scenario of little appeal to graduates and that his attempt is foredoomed to failure.

Yours truly,  
Denis Fillion  
G.S.A. Member

### Individual Interpretation

Dear Editor;

I would like this opportunity to express my "deep-scaled ignorance" regarding the influx of sexist material which is dominating our school newspaper.

We must first ask ourselves what determines whether a publication is sexist or not. The article in last Friday's *Brunswickan* leaves the impression that any use of a beautiful woman for the promotion of a product is

sexist.

In my experience most product promotions involve only the most beautiful subjects, whether they be women, men, children or babies. Should all these groups be concerned with being misrepresented or exploited or is it only the woman's problem?

If a leather clad woman promotes bondage, does then a naked baby, seen in diaper commercials denote child molestation?

The answer here lies in the individuals interpretation. That individuals interpretation being equally valid as the others. For example, to the more optimistic feminist, the Van Oyen advertisement undoubtedly signifies today's woman's new, stronger stand in society as an equal power which is not to be underestimated.

"Nothing is, but thinking makes it so" -unknown.

Richard Hall

### Thanks

Dear colleagues, students and friends of Bernie Vigod:

We are simply overwhelmed by the many moving cards, letters and contributions we received in memory of Bernie. We are unable to answer each one personally.

We thank everyone who gave us support and comfort during our time sorrow. We gratefully acknowledge and deeply appreciate your thoughtfulness and many acts of kindness.

Sincerely,  
The Family of Bernie Vigod

### Off Base

Dear Editor;

I feel that I must respond to the article prepared on the behalf of the student women's committee. While much can be said about male & female ignorance, I will concentrate on the more blatant interpretations cited in the article.

In # 2 viewpoint, "women are typically regarded as not being 'serious' about pursuing their careers". I am sorry to report that in my two years at UNB not once have I come across that type of attitude, hardly typical I would say.

In # 4 article quotes, "further, the body english of the male editor is *undeniable* (my emphasis) violent." That is quite an interpretation of the

ad, I must say.

In # 10 the Van Oyen ad, "this ad denotes bondage, gratuitous use of female flesh..." I'm sorry to say that all I see is a good looking girl with long black hair in a low cut dress. Somehow I seem to have missed the bondage part.

My point is that the Students Women's Committee ie Karen Braun et. al. are way off base with their interpretations. I could easily interpret each of those ads in totally the opposite way. But then, everyone would call me a fool too.

Ross Millar

### OOPS

Dear Editor,

I am writing in response to the report "Council Brief" that was published in *The Brunswickan* of November 25, 1988. I am referring specifically to the line which stated that Dean Frost was "waiting to hear from Josephine Tan with respect to the possible acceptance of the G.S.A. as members of the Student Union" (p. 25).

On behalf of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), I take strong exception to that line because it is inaccurate. I am hereby taking one of the necessary steps to rectify the mistake. The GSA was not, is not and will not be seeking membership within the Student Union. Rather, the issue revolved around a GSA voluntary financial contribution to certain services provided by the Student Union such as *The Brunswickan*, CHSR and support of groups with both undergraduate and graduate membership. This contribution is offered solely because the GSA feels that some graduate students do benefit from these services.

The GSA is the graduate equivalent of the SU. However, we are an independent student organization separate from the SU. We serve the graduate students much as the SU serves the undergraduates. We have our own Constitution, By-Laws, elected Executive Committee, graduate representatives on several University administrative and academic committees and national student conferences, issue our own graduate student I.D. cards, support our own graduate groups and provide unique services to our membership that benefit them as graduate students.

I have been in touch with Mr. Dean Frost and expressed my surprise and displeasure over the report. He has assured me that a correction from the Student Union will be issued in the next *Brunswickan* (2nd December 1988) in a prominent section. I do not believe that the mistake carried a malicious intent and was borne purely out of Mr. Frost's misconception of the status and intent of the GSA. I have also requested Mr. Frost in a previous meeting that when he meet with his committee over the GSA financial offer, he will point out the independent status of the GSA and voluntary nature of the contribution.

Thank you for allowing me the space to set things straight.

Sincerely,  
Josephine Tan  
GSA President

### Pissed off...

Dear Editor,

In response to the Features section last week on sexism. When writing publicity-planned material it's fine to state your own point of view or even the view of a certain committee. However, one has no right to make such statements on behalf of certain portion of the human race, namely women.

I am a woman, maybe even a lady, yet I did not take offence to the said material, nor did I find it necessary to waste precious moments of my life to dawdle over a *student* newspaper, tearing each section apart bit by bit to write an essay on what I don't like about it.

I also am an editor - a FEMALE editor and I can't begin to tell you of the numerous times other MALE editors have asked my opinion on certain issues. Maybe my opinions are not always correct but at least (in my opinion) they are probably more representative of the average female student.

Do me a favor, Karen. Take the cotton batten out of your ears and shove it in your mouth! We are sick and tired of you and your pompous followers pissing everyone off!

Sincerely  
D.J. Hannah

Continued on page 8