

# BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of the Brunswickan. Letters may be sent to Rm. 35 in the Student Union Building. Deadline: 1 pm on Tuesday. Usual maximum length: 300 words. Please include name, student number and phone number

Continued from page 6

shock and possibly dying."

It was not until 1871 that an Alabama court in the U.S. became the first to rescind a husband's legal and ancient right to beat his wife. However, sexual violence in marriage is still legal in many of the states in the U.S. and all of Great Britain. In Canada it was only a decade ago that members of Parliament laughed when the issue of wife abuse was brought up. And it wasn't until 1983 that rape within marriage was made illegal in Canada.

Last year in Canada, 60 percent of women murder victims were killed by their "lovers" or ex-lovers. And, getting back to the point of my original column which began this controversy, men who beat their wives to death can still go into court, say that they didn't mean to kill her - just beat her like they always do - and they get a few years in prison or sometimes jail on a manslaughter charge rather than a murder charge.

So, Mr. Scott, you seem to indicate that slapping is acceptable as long as no bruises are left. So if slapping but leaving no bruises is acceptable, then how long do you think it will take before slapping with bruises is acceptable, or even legal. And where does it go from there...beating but no bruises... then beating with bruises.... and so on and so on.

With all the violence against women still out there, I don't think it would take too damn long before the whole spectrum is perfectly acceptable again.

So, as a woman, zero tolerance of wife beating is the only level acceptable to me.

Yours truly,  
Valerie Kilfoil

## Media abuse

Dear editor,

I would like to express my appreciation for the letter you published by Professor Dwight G. Scott, of the Department of mechanical En-

gineering, on November 20th in the context of unfair charges against Dr. Essam Hussein. He ends by saying that "Those who have read incomplete, misleading, and biased accounts deserve to know the truth. Perhaps some of the silent majority will voice an opinion to others in this regard."

It is very likely that he will be disappointed to find that the silent majority would remain silent. But it is really not fair to the silent majority. How can a person with his usual obligations (in our case, a faculty member or a student) be expected to look into a plethora of news items and decide about the authenticity of each one of them? It is a matter of time and resources. But for his explanation, I would have been left with the whole thing in a very different perspective. A father trying to save his son from an abusive mother, at a moment of frustration and anger, slaps her once. That certainly does not qualify him to be a "wife beater".

The problem lies with those who are in a position to misuse the media. The modern means of communication are swift and effective. They can do a great deal of damage to an individual's reputation. No amount of apology can really make the difference. Obviously, it is for this reason, that most religions considered false witness a serious sin. In the past, an individual's personal witness was confined to a few, but now it can brainwash literally thousands of people. A minor error on the part of a writer can be very misleading. Our budding journalists may not be conscious of the abuse of their power.

Dr. Thomas A. Fish, in the Opinion Column of the same issue, has tried to explain his behaviour towards his wife. He says: "Although I didn't realize it at the time, I was frequently abusive toward my spouse. . . . I did not come home drunk and beat my wife. . . . Nonetheless, I was an abuser. Although my abuse was primarily verbal and emotional, it was without question abuse. . . . A bruised body will often heal in a few days. A bruised heart and spirit may never heal."

I would suggest that a person bruised by the "media abuse" may never heal either. But the problem of media abuse is a universal prob-

lem. It requires serious study. The present concept of "freedom of the press" is outdated and meaningless. As I tried to indicate in the Opinion Column I wrote earlier on the topic of "Holocaust Denial", the media sway too much power over our feelings and emotions, and we are more like puppets on their string.

One of the most important aspect of media abuse is misrepresentation of facts. I have seen completely false statements on certain subjects. To call a person a "wife beater" and unworthy of being a faculty member at a university, because he once slapped his wife, or because a person was abusive emotionally, is a misrepresentation of facts, and in its effect, it can be worse than the physical abuse that Ms. Valerie Kilfoil wished to emphasize in her article on November 6. She was guilty of "media abuse" even if she was not conscious of it. Apparently, her off the cuff remark about Malcolm Ross about lack of objectivity, is also a form of "media abuse".

Professor Scott's explanation deserved a more prominent display, possibly the column used by Ms. Kilfoil, so that more of your readers would "know the truth".

Matin Yaqzan

## Coping with everyday stress

Dear Editor,

The Canadian Mental Health Association, Fredericton/Oromocto Region is investigating the need for a self-help group for people finding it difficult to cope with the everyday stresses of the workplace or of raising a family.

If you feel you could benefit from being a member of this self-help group, please contact the office of the CMHA at 458-1803 or write to me at the Victoria Health Centre, 65 Brunswick Street, Fredericton, N.B. E3B 1G5. All information will be confidential.

Wendy Kent  
President, CHMA Fredericton/  
Oromocto Region

## Stop flogging CHSR

Dear Editor,

Greetings:  
This is an Open Letter to all Student Union Representatives, and the Executive.

I recently learned that a vote was taken on Wednesday, November 25, to

deny CHSR sufficient funding for the second of two paid positions at the station. Upon hearing this, I promptly went ballistic for about twenty minutes, cursing a blue streak as I achieved orbital velocity. I've splashed down now, but the issue remains no less volatile.

Bluntly speaking, you must not deny CHSR the funding it needs to operate. If you do, you'll kill it. CHSR is an Alternative Radio Station and it cannot, by CRTC mandate, go after mandate, go after money the way commercial radio stations do it. If the SU won't support CHSR, CHSR is screwed, because it simply can't go out and find other ways to meet its budget. To do so means CHSR can't maintain the skills and the leadership continuity it needs to stay healthy; this is what paid positions are all about.

Now, for the record, I'm not a student, nor do I have any connection to the university. I am merely a CHSR listener, one who genuinely appreciates the existence of alternative radio in this city. "50,000 milliwatts of FM power, your alternative radio beacon on the hill"; that slogan hits it right on the mark. It's a unique and valuable asset, CHSR is; listen for your self if you don't believe me.

You, as SU Reps, will no doubt someday leave Fredericton after you graduate, and leave CHSR behind. I get to live here (ain't I the lucky one?). So, if CHSR is taken down because of a gaggle of short-sighted, budget-picky, student politicians, let's just say I'll be pissed off, disappointed, saddened, furious, dejected, disillusioned, frustrated, exasperated, and not just a little bit disgusted. Did I mention pissed off?

So I must ask you, in the strongest possible terms, to put aside the usual political guff that entangles everything UNB-ish, and find out what CHSR's all about. I don't care how you do it; send a committee down to camp out in the control room and study the place; interview every member of CHSR who's breathing; heck, get *The Bruns* to do a three-part investigative report; I don't care, whatever it takes!!

You are rational, intelligent people that's why you're on the SU, that's why you're at UNB (contrary evidence aside, for the nonce). I've got to believe that when you do find out what this dinky little hole-in-the-wall radio station means, you will support it. It is important that you do so, because CHSR is important.

I shall leave off here, since I'm starting to fall a (\*yawn\*) sleep; it's getting late, or early, depending. Any more of this, and I could be accused of flogging a dead horse; but no, I'm done, I've said my peace for the moment. In the meantime, please stop flogging CHSR.

Whiplessly yours,  
Fred Brown

## A look at the yes side

Dear Editor,

The Prime Minister and every Premier in Canada should resign if there is a speck of political honor and decency remaining in them. Canadians must not be complacent

towards these men because they threatened the stability and the future of Canada.

Many have wondered how it was possible for the nazi regime under Adolph Hitler to get Germans to support it and to eventually commit nightmarish atrocities. They also wondered why the mind games played by the nazi propagandists were so successful in a society that was advanced, well educated and considered highly cultured.

If Canadians consider the tactics used by those who pushed the "Yes" side of the recent referendum, many of the mysteries will be solved. There are many similarities between the tactics used by the propagandists of the nazi regime and the tactics used by the propagandists of the "Yes" side in the recent referendum.

Both used scare tactics, played on people's emotions, used exaggerations, raised questions about the loyalty of those who disagreed, used misrepresentation, used misinformation, made unsupportable claims and used mind games. They played on the nationalist sentiments of their citizens and if what they said was questioned or rejected, one was being not only disloyal but threatening the existence of the state.

The nazi regime emphasized the importance of protecting their racial purity and their culture. How far is that attitude from entrenching or trying to entrench in the Canadian Constitution and institutions the legal designation of one group being a distinct society with the legal right to preserve and promote that distinct society? Is not the attempt to entrench Bill 88 in the Canadian Constitution an attempt to create a distinct society in New Brunswick? Any politician who supports such legislation is not trying to create unity, harmony and societal peace in Canada or among the linguistic-cultural identities which make up the national culture of Canada but rather is trying to create divisions, conflict and instability in Canada. If the shortsighted politicians keep it up they are going to have the non-French and the French hating each other, in perpetual conflict and even killing each other.

No identity in Canada needs special protection such as being legally a distinct society with the legal right to have the general public pay the cost of preserving and promoting that distinct society. The Canadian Constitution has a disallowance and reservation clause which enable the Federal government to disallow legislation which may be passed in any legislature in Canada which it considers oppressive, excessive and not in the best interest of Canada. Some may ask, if that is the case why was the Quebec legislature able to pass the various laws denying human rights to the non-French of Quebec? The Federal government ignored its responsibility to protect the rights of all Canadians. The Acadians are protected, the English are protected the Ukrainians are protected and every other Canadian linguistic-cultural identity is protected from legislation which would deny them their linguistic-cultural freedoms. None, though, have the right to expect special treatment and favoritism and none have the right to expect that other Canadians will pay for their favoritism or pay to preserve their identity. If the "Yes" side would have won the referendum this clause would have been repealed.

The nazi regime undermined the German Constitution, took away rights and forbade political dissent. Did not the "Yes" side try to get all the parties in Canada to accept and support the Charlottetown accord, did it not try to stifle (sic) dissent? The nazi regime refused to openly debate its laws and changes it was making to German society. How many parties and politicians in Canada demanded that the Canadian legislatures and the Federal parliament analyze and openly debate the contents of the accord? How many politicians questioned the use of a first ministers meeting to negotiate what would or would not be in a Canadian Constitution? How many questioned the undermining of Canada's Parliamentary system where legislation is supposed to be created and go through the process of being either accepted or rejected?

Think of the mind games used by both the nazi propagandists and the propagandists of the "Yes" side. I could give many examples but consider this: It was supposed to be a vote on the contents of an accord but it became a vote for Canada or a vote against Canada. How many times did you hear the ramifications? The tactics used by the "Yes" side demonstrate why one cannot be complacent about freedom, liberty and democratic rights and why they demand eternal vigilance.

James N. Clifford

## SAM MOON POWER UNIT

Maritime Legends

Sam Moon and Richie Oakley

Rock the House Down-  
On the stage and on the tables

## OAK ROOM PUB

OROMOCTO MALL

Friday and Saturday Dec. 4th & 5th

Advance tickets: \$6.00

Door: \$8.00

CALL FOR RESERVATIONS

357-3136

## Shades Of Light

For Christmas Shopping

2 For 1 on Selected  
Jewellery, Clothing, Pottery,  
Candles, Pewter



288 Regent St.  
455-1318