

## People should have mutual respect for others

Dear Editor,

After reading last week's Soundoff titled "Sub for use of all people?" I was dismayed at the irrationality of the writer's argument and felt nothing less than obligated to present my opposing views. Before beginning, I must clarify that I am not affiliated with the Flag organization, and have never partaken in any of their activities.

Primarily, I would like to comment that I found the majority of the statements to be based on biases and personal convictions, rather than on rationality and sound practical judgement. In addition, I found that the letter contained many contradictions.

The Sub is not the library. Even during the "height of exams", the Sub cafeteria airs CHSR and the chattering of people is often enough to

disturb the "serious student". Had another organization been playing "loud noise", I doubt very much that the disturbance would have been as alarming or disrespectful.

Homosexuality is heartlessly portrayed as a disease and the author makes some absurd analogies between homosexuality, incest and bestiality. Perhaps a broader knowledge of human sexuality would help the writer to realize that homosexuality is no longer diagnosed as neither a "sickness" nor a "disease". Nor is it contagious! Thus, by holding their activities, Flag is not attempting to corrupt the students' minds.

The writer seems uneasy that Flag, by means of holding their activities on campus are advertising and promoting their "alternative lifestyle". It disturbs me that such a con-

tradition was made, since Flag was earlier criticized for not publicizing their event. If the event was not publicized, I cannot see how they possibly could be advertising their "alternative lifestyle".

In addition, there is a needless concern that the student population is contributing \$45 a year to such an organization. When an organization, catering to a population not strictly comprised of University students, makes use of room 26, rent to the SRC is indeed paid. Therefore, when the use of "our" building is made, such organizations may well be contributing to the financial well-being of the University.

Such social stigmas and ideologies as were presented in last week's Soundoff, causes tremendous psychological pain for many gay people. Discrimination and prejudice,

merely because of one's lifestyle, is an ever-present reality for most homosexuals. It must not be forgotten, however, that homosexuals, like heterosexuals, have the right to live with dignity. This will only be attained when societal attitudes change sufficiently toward an acceptance, or at the very least, a show of respect, for a lifestyle other than one's own. I agree with

the writer's point that what we do in private has repercussions on ourselves and that what we are and believe has repercussions on others. But if one's lifestyle causes no harmful repercussions, wouldn't society be a better place to live if all individuals had mutual respect for the well-being of others?

Sincerely,  
"Live and Let Live"

## Wide ties and protests

Dear Editor,

Concerning the letter entitled "SUB For The Use Of All People?" which appeared in the January 28th Sound-Off Section of the Brunswickan: Why courageous 'M.K.' do you not sign your full name? Your views on homosexuality (to wit, a "bestial, perverse activity") are lamentable, puerile and unintelligent, though typical if that be solace. In opposition I assert that one's sexual preferences are no more subject to claims of immorality than is one's choice of toothpaste. There are too many pain-causing elements about for anyone to worry concerning who gives pleasure to whom.

Your statement that though you do not hate homosexuals you believe they should not be

publically active is analogous to saying that you don't mind blacks as long as they are "niggers" in private. Further, you "object to the idea that what consenting adults do in private is solely their own business" -presumably you favor legislating sexuality. Imagine if you will (if you can) the spectre of some duly endorsed Love Police chasing about censoring natural tendencies, denying free choice. Is this a better state? - Hitler, McCarthy and those doormen of the Iron Maiden thought so.

Really dear, tag - bashing went out with wide ties; besides, you know what they say, 'methinks he doth protest too much'.

Gregory Betts

## Homophobia. Is it catching?

Dear Editor,

I would like to respond to M.K.'s letter of January 28, 1983: "Sub for use of all people?" M.K.'s main assertion is that homosexuality is perverse. No evidence or argument is provided to support this position. (M.K. does introduce a red herring, however, when s/he mentions incest and bestiality. This is the old guilt by association trick, and if it were taken seriously then society should discourage heterosexual activity, since most incest is heterosexual). One can only conclude that M.K. has defined homosexuality as perverse. Such an arbitrary definition tells us more about M.K. than it does about homosexuals. M.K.'s final point, that one's personal life

has repercussions on public life, may or may not be correct. However, since M.K. has not shown that homosexuality is harmful in any way, this is irrelevant and so is another red herring.

In between these two lynchpins of the letter, M.K. rambles on about students paying \$45 to the SRC, and the unified opposition of the student body to "homosexual and lesbian activities" in the SUB. This ignores the glaringly obvious point that the homosexual men and women in the student community also pay \$45 to the SRC, and presumably do not object to FLAG using the SUB. By another virtuoso feat of definition, M.K. has decided that homosexual students are not part of the student popula-

tion. Furthermore, s/he also ignores the fact that some of the (presumptively) heterosexual student body (me, for one) may not object to FLAG using the SUB. If M.K. is so assured of the support of the "approx. 6,000 students," why is s/he afraid to publish his or her name? Overall, the "arguments" would be funny if they were not sad.

In sum, M.K.'s letter amounts to a virulent expression of homophobia. I suggest that this is M.K.'s own problem. Finally, I suggest that The Brunswickan should not afford the protection of anonymity to writers of hate letters.

Yours sincerely,  
Colm Kelly

## Setting the record straight

Dear Editor:

In response to an article in last weeks "soundoff" concerning the use of the SUB for FLAG pubs, I'd like to get a few facts straight.

To start with, I would like to identify myself as the CP who worked at the FLAG pub Dec. 17/82 and say that "M.K." was the one creating the disturbance not the people in the pub.

Secondly, although the SUB is for students, rooms in the SUB are rented to non-student organizations if not already

reserved by a student organization but non-student organizations are charged more. And, the SUB cannot discriminate against any organization. Therefore, "M.K.", your \$45 does not support FLAG pubs. In fact, FLAG pubs help support our SUB.

Thirdly, non-student functions are not publicized on campus. If that bothers you, "M.K.", why didn't you complain when the Bank of Commerce didn't advertise their Christmas party in the ballroom?

Lastly, if you reread your letter "M.K.", you'll notice you

contradicted yourself several times. And, "M.K." if you really believe in what you're saying, why are you afraid to sign your letter? Have you got something to hide (eg. in the closet)?

I would like to add that as a CP who's worked at every kind of pub on campus the FLAG pubs are the most civilized. There was no beer throwing, no fights and no damage. That's a lot more than I can say for a lot of other pubs I've worked at.

Yours truly,  
Steven McGill

**TREAT THEM TO**

# SUNDAY BRUNCH

**SUNDAYS AT  
CAP'T SUBMARINE**

**2 for the price of 1  
on all mini subs all day.  
Limit ONE per customer**

**FREDERICTON SHOPPING MALL**

**455-7765**

**270 RESTIGOUCHE RD. OROMOCTO**

**357-5300**



Monday to Thursday 6 pm - 2 am  
2 free credits with every Sub purchased