

# Blood and Thunder

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

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

### Baggaley letter "misrepresents"

Dear Sir:

I have never felt it necessary to write a "Letter to the Editor." Mr. J.W.J. Baggaley's letter of last issue has changed all that. I found his letter offensive. Not only was his argument convoluted, and at some points incomprehensible, it also made accusations that have no basis in fact. In addition, it misrepresented the contents of the letter that Mr. Larry Long read in council on January 14.

Mr. Baggaley claims that the letter Mr. Long read was "libellous and slanderous" and he accuses Mr. Long, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Bosnitch of "malicious intent." How does he prove this? Before he wrote his letter did he speak to any of the gentlemen whose reputation he slandered?

It seems to me that the best way to fathom someone's intent is to speak to them. Unfortunately, Mr. Baggaley gives no indication that he has spoken to any of the men he has accused.

He accuses Mr. Long of taking "it upon himself to propagate slander." First, such an accusation must be backed up by proof that the letter is slanderous, and second, that Mr. Long read it knowing this. To make such assumptions, without having directly spoken to Mr. Long is ridiculous. The worst we can say about Mr. Long is that he *might* have made an error in judgement.

What about Mr. Bennett? As chairman of the meeting he was, to some degree, responsible for the proceedings. To expect him, however, to have evaluated the letter and to have forbidden its reading in light of the fact that it was a communication that Mr. Long had received and was including in his report, is ludicrous. If he had been informed of Mr. Long's intentions before the beginning of the meeting, perhaps he would have advised against reading the letter? Who knows what his intentions were? Did Mr. Baggaley bother to find out?

The basis for Mr. Baggaley's indictment of Mr. Bosnitch takes the cake. When Mr. Bosnitch said that he was "ultimately responsible for everything," "I believe people interpreted this as meaning that as SU President he accepted blame for any inadequacies in the overall operation of the Union. To blame the reading of the letter, or its contents on Mr. Bosnitch is stretching the limits of reasoning to the absurd. I ask

whether Mr. Bosnitch is responsible for the cigarette burns in the carpet in the Blue Lounge? I hardly think so.

As I sit here writing I have two documents in front of me: an issue of the *Brunswickian* in which Mr. Baggaley's letter is found and a copy of the letter Mr. Long read at Council. Comparing the two I find some inconsistencies.

Mr. Baggaley claims that the controversial letter describes "a certain incompetency on the part of former Comptroller Aubrey Kirkpatrick in his dealings with the CSL Exchange." This is a false statement. Nowhere in the letter do I find reference to any incompetency or to the Exchange. In addition, Mr. Baggaley states that the letter "constitutes a collation of so-called Honoraria Reports...that misrepresent the actual facts." First, I fail to understand how Honorarium Reports compiled in 1980 and 1982 can misrepresent the facts of the present case and second, I wonder how Mr. Baggaley can judge the validity of these reports, or their relation to the Kirkpatrick case, after he has said he has "no knowledge" of them.

To make matters worse, Mr. Baggaley writes that the anonymous letter demands "the return of th honorarium and other funds Mr. Kirkpatrick has received in his official capacity," when in fact the letter reads that he "owes the Student Union the full amount of the honorarium granted to the position of Comptroller." Again, the truth is misrepresented. The letter points to the honorarium, not to the honorarium and "other funds."

As a point of interest, I ask what these "other funds" may be?

Mr. Baggaley states that in his letter "it will be shown (that) the misconstrued concern voiced in the letter is nothing short of a slanderous act." I loathe to inform you, Sir, that your goal has been missed by a considerable distance. At no point do you prove anything.

I agree with Mr. Baggaley when he said that "the issue at stake is whether the concern put forward is indeed a valid opinion, or whether it is mere slander (and personal attack)." To me, however, it is not so much the alleged slander of the anonymous letter, but the malicious attack of Mr. Baggaley that is at issue here.

The right to speak one's mind is a valued democratic tradition. We must remember, however, that with a right comes a responsibility. If I were to publicly accuse someone of "malicious slander," then it is my duty to provide concrete and factual evidence.

Obviously, Mr. Baggaley fails to provide this evidence, and in the course of his failure he commits the crime of which he irresponsibly charges others. Mr. Baggaley, I believe you owe some people an apology.

Sincerely,  
S. Lawrence Hansen

### A discussion of "guts"

Dear Editor:

Last week's issue carried a submission by Jeff Baggaley entitled "Letter Slanderous" in which Baggaley appeared to cover up for his friend Aubrey Kirkpatrick's lack of performance as Campus Services' Treasurer. Baggaley stated that a letter of complaint against Kirkpatrick was libelous and that he, (as a make believe lawyer?), thought action should be taken against the Student Union officials who responded to the complaint.

Baggaley made certain to steer clear of the actual complaints against Kirkpatrick, choosing instead to change the subject to a discussion of whether or not the complaint should have been presented to council at all. In fact, Baggaley himself admitted in his letter that he "has no knowledge" of the reports and council regulations upon which the complaint was based. He nevertheless proclaimed that by informing council of the complaint, members of the executive were guilty of "propagating slander." What Baggaley failed to see was that it was the duty of Vice-President Long to inform council of the complaint; and even more importantly, that stated the facts in a matter may be unpleasant for those who are afraid of the truth, but it is certainly not "slanderous." If Jeff Baggaley is suggesting that executives of the Student Union should suppress complaints to the council just because his friend Aubrey Kirkpatrick finds the truth unpleasant, he has a very warped view of the role of a democratic student government.

When I first met Jeff Baggaley about two years I remember him telling me "I'm going to Harvard next term" and that he didn't have the time for student politics. The next thing I remember about Jeff is that he was back at UNB the next year and in fact ended up on council. He was then to go on record as the only councillor opposing the principle of students running businesses in the SUB (he was the business faculty rep at that time!). The same Jeff Baggaley who blamed the "fiasco" at Campus Ser-

vices on just two of the Directors in his letter last issue, was the man who like his friend Kirkpatrick, resigned from the CSL Board of Directors when the going got tough. Last but not least, Baggaley ended his career in student politics by resigning from council before completing even one-half term of his term. Now Jeff wants everyone to believe him and trust his judgement when he poses as a lawyer and tells us not to respond to complaints about his friend. I, for one, am sorry but I just can't go on putting faith in the world or judgement of Jeff Baggaley.

In the future, rather than serving as someone else's mouthpiece, Baggaley would do well to let the accused defend themselves, so that he can spend his time contributing something other than his resignation, or misleading hate mail to this Student Union. As for his contention that a student is lacking in "guts" if they prefer not to have their name dragged through the mud for pointing out violations of Student Union policy, I can only say to Jeff that personal attacks such as the letter he submitted to last week's *Brunswickian* have probably done more to discourage the average student from speaking out than anything else.

As a final note, before Jeff Baggaley accuses any other concerned students of lacking "guts" he should tell us all how much "guts" it took him to resign from the various posts he held in this Student Union.

John Bosnitch

### Aitken apologizes for bus snafu

On Saturday, January 19th, Aitken House invited the Ladies of the Dunn, Tibbits Hall, and McLeod House to Mactaquac for sliding as part of our Aitken Week activities. Two buses were hired to transport everyone out to the sliding area. After picking up the majority of the group in the Tibbits parking lot, one bus was supposed to proceed on to McLeod to pick up the remainder of the group.

Upon reaching the top gates of the University the first bus turned left towards the Trans Canada Highway. When we inquired about the reason for this, the bus driver said the second bus was picking McLeod up. When the second bus came along the same situation occurred. And they were told that McLeod had already been picked up by bus number one.

When both buses reached Mactaquac we realized what had happen the parties on each bus thought the "other" bus

was picking up McLeod.

The men of Aitken offer our deepest apologies to the ladies of McLeod. Though we were led to believe that McLeod was indeed being picked up, we still must accept the majority of the criticism.

We hope you accept our apologies and understand what actually did happen. It certainly was not on purpose. We are especially sorry to your social chairmen Pam and Carolyn, since you had to arrange everything for the trip. We can assure you that it will not happen again.

Jody Robinson.

President

For the Men of Aitken

### "It's tough being nice"

Dear Editor:

It's tough being nice. You just don't get any appreciation. It's even harder to open up and show what you are feeling. It just ain't manly to do so. I have yet to see the liberated man I hear so much about. There just ain's no such animal. Women it seems are just seeing men in a new light now and the men always had the "new" qualities. I really think it's true that most women do not know what is good for them. Chalk it up to the Soap opera syndrome. Women don't like the nice guys but the tough guys who are cool and treat them terribly. On Friday, January 12, I saw this guy beat a girl (girlfriend?) up on the stairs by the circle at the SUB. Chris and I helped her but she still let the creep get into her car and leave with her. At least she was thankful. Sometimes they bitch at you for helping them. I know sometimes there are girls who deserve a good slap but I can't do it.

I don't know why the lady put up with it! I suppose it must be exciting. I mean, doesn't it happen in all the soaps. It certainly beats dental appointments and grocery shopping.

This type of guy seems to be quite popular. They are never without a girlfriend. I really don't understand it but then I don't understand a lot of things.

I think sometimes the girl thinks that she can't get anyone else or no one will want her. I really don't know but I'd like to. One thing though; to that blond on the steps on the Friday, take care, someday you'll find him.

Just thought someone might listen.

Signed  
M.