

BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the Editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of *The Brunswickan*. Letters to the Editor may be sent to Rm. 35, Student Union Building. Deadline: 5p.m. Tuesdays. Maximum length: 300 words.

Martial talking

Dear Sir,

The militarists, who think that crises between nations should be solved militarily and that peaceful negotiation and compromise is appeasement are dominating foreign affairs. The classic example is President Bush who actually talked of being willing to negotiate and having walked the extra mile while with the next breath said there would be no concessions and issued ultimatums.

Tragically, those who see everything in military terms; that believe might is right; who believe in and want victory at any cost; who believe that power comes of the barrel of the gun; that one shoots first and asks questions later; and the end justifies the means had their way in the Persian Gulf crisis.

If we are going to elevate our consciousness, create a new way of thinking and looking at the world with its problems, we must think about the principles that have caused the problems and replace them with better, more humane and enlightened principles. Hopefully, those of more humane temperaments and more enlightened minds, who see the dangers in a one-sided military approach will raise their voices and concerns to cancel out the militarists. Thankfully there are people all over the world demanding that the military carnage stop and questioning the motives for the war.

Can anyone imagine Jesus Christ, the greatest humanitarian example the world has ever seen, who said put up the sword, blessed are the peace makers, love your enemies, turn the other cheek as a pilot in a B52 carpet bombing? Can anyone imagine Him bombing any village, town or city in Iraq or Kuwait? Is it possible for him to have been a part of the surprise attack in the dark of night on Baghdad to start a war? Not by might nor by power but by my spirit saith the Lord.

For those who believe there can be such a thing as a just war or an unjust war, please read Erich Fromm's book, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. He gives a description of what a just or an unjust war may be. He describes how populations are deceived and made to think an unjust war is a just one. He says any society which is defending itself and its way of life against an invader is fighting a just war.

When President Bush called his war a moral and a just one I couldn't believe my ears. War is the expression of what is the worst in some of human-kind. War is the choice between evils and one chooses [sic] the lesser evil. It is a choice to be exercised only under extreme provocation, extreme threat and when one's way of life and society are being threatened. The war in the Persian Gulf is certainly not moral and I have serious doubts about it being just.

Is Iraq a threat to the world? Is it a threat to the USA, England, France, Canada etc.? Iraq is a Third World nation and people of 17 million with imported military technology and weapons. The Western nations which have declared war on Iraq, for very questionable reasons, and attacked Iraq, have an incredible scientific, engineering, military, technical founda-

tion and are some of the most advanced nations in the world. In comparison to the USA, France, England, Japan, Germany etc., Iraq is only a few steps away from the bronze age. Perhaps this insight will tone down the extreme rhetoric and allow a calm, sensible assessment of Iraq and the war.

The issue of Kuwait should have been tackled in the United Nations long before the presumptuous move by Saddam Hussein to occupy it. I agreed with the embargo because I thought it would give a breathing space to thrash out the underlying causes of the problem and allow common sense and reason to examine the problem. There are questions to be asked. Does a people have the right to reject boundaries which were imposed by past Colonial masters? Why weren't the people of Kuwait allowed to vote on the issue of the boundary in a referendum? Why didn't the UN encourage such a vote? A nagging question I have is, did President Bush use his office to engineer and unnecessary war?

I am absolutely against the production and spread of chemical, biological, nerve and nuclear weapons, and the technology used to make them. No nation should be selling nuclear reactors because this leads to the spread of nuclear weapons. An international conference should be held to find ways of preventing [sic] the spread of dangerous technology with guarantees by those that have the dangerous weapons that they will only keep enough for defensive purposes with a view to, one day, abolish them entirely. There should be technology transfers of a non-military nature that will help Third World countries improve their standard of living.

If the Western nations cannot be peace makers and help all the states of the Middle East to get along and settle their internal problems peacefully, they certainly should not encourage and cause wars. All the people of the Middle East have suffered enough. The military on both sides have targeted civilians and are guilty of crimes against humanity and war crimes. Those who think they can kill innocent civilians, whatever the pretext, and that there will be no retribution are very deceived. They have forever scarred their minds and forever lost something of their humanity.

Both President Bush and Saddam Hussein appear to have the same mind set. They seem obsessed over militarism and see everything in the context of military solutions. Both talk of God being on their side and both have the audacity to suggest that war is moral. Both accuse the other of being evil and representing evil. It appears they would rather act militarily than to use reason to solve their perceived problems. There is very little flexibility in their personalities. Perhaps this accounts for the irrationality of the Persian Gulf crisis.

Here is a proverb to ponder: Seeth thou a man wise in his own conceits, (personal opinion, proud, closed minded) there is more hope of a fool than he. It is sad if this is found in a leader, and an international tragedy if it is found in two.

James N. Clifford

Jason is not amused

Dear Mr. Cardoso,

In response to the views that you expressed in *Mugwump* in *The Brunswickan's* February 8 1991 issue, I feel that I should respond to the questions that you've brought up. You called me concerning Mr. Cumberbash and expressed your desire for me to book his band in which you stated that UJAMAA would open for Mr. Cumberbash's band, for free. If you do remember, the dates that you gave me (Feb. 14 or 15) were already filled. When I asked you if there was another date in which Mr. Cumberbash could bring in his band you said that you would check it out. Whether or not you actually tried to see if another date was suitable or not, is unknown. It is true that Mr. Cumberbash called me at home to see about booking his band on Feb. 14 or 15. I told him that it would not be possible to book his band at that time. Now why he did not know that those dates were not available after you, Mr. Cardoso told me that you would see if there was another date that Mr. Cumberbash's band could play, I'm not sure. My only guess is that you did not actually talk to Mr. Cumberbash. I can see why Mr. Cardoso would be upset for as was expressed by UJAMAA, it would have been a great opportunity for their band. Had Mr. Cumberbash called earlier in this semester the band could have had that date that they wanted. Mr. Cumberbash only had those days open for his band and those days were filled.

As for the question of my absence from my office during that week, I feel that this point is moot. That week was Winter Carnival Week and I was extremely busy insuring that all went well. Had Mr. Cardoso tried to make an appointment to meet with me, things would have been a lot easier.

Now I don't mind the fact that Mr. Cardoso is upset that he could not have his way, nor am I upset that he wrote to EDUCATE the readers of *The Brunswickan*, but I do mind the one sidedness in which the STORY was written (although I should be used to this). If Mr. Cardoso wishes to tell a story, he should tell the whole story.

Jason E. Burns
VP Activities and Promotions
UNB Student Union

Geography blunder

Dear Editor,

This letter is in response to the front page illustration of February 8 edition of *The Brunswickan*. The portrayal of Québec being separated from the rest of Canada was the clear intention of the illustration, yet the *Brunswickan* made a serious geographical error in alienating Québec. The inclusion of Labrador in this encapulation [sic] was a careless error and is emphasized here to enforce the fact that the tenth province of Canada is known as Newfoundland and Labrador. Many people tend to forget the mainland

part of this province and for many years, Québécois have held the notion that Labrador was indeed their own. I would like to point out a landmark decision made by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London on March 1, 1927 which clearly defined the inland boundaries of Labrador and its assignment of this land area to the colony of Newfoundland. Together, Newfoundland and Labrador later joined in Confederation with Canada on April 1, 1949.

As a resident of Labrador, I found *The Brunswickan's* illustration offensive and surprising as it clearly exhibited the ignorance of some people towards the basic geography of Canada. On these times of current unrest and disunity in Québec and indeed Canada, I feel that the illustration in question was a distasteful joke and it will only stir up more bad blood among Canadians.

A proud Labradorian and
Newfoundlander
Doug Gover.

The Brunswickan acknowledges that it made a significant error in the front page graphic. We appreciate humbly, the lesson in Canadian Geography and hope that our error will be forgiven. We apologize for any offence this error may have caused. *The Brunswickan* was in no way trying to make a political statement.

Ed.

Coming out

Dear Sir,

Much has transpired in the pages of this publication since the arrival of "In the Pink" some time ago. Nothing has prompted me to commit words to paper till now.

I am a member of the gay and lesbian community here at UNB/STU. I am one of the invisible members. By that I mean, I am not openly known as gay, and I do not make a point to lead everyone to believe that I am. Just as I do not lead them to believe I am straight either. I am what and who I am. People may or may not make presumptions about my private life, I cannot stop that, but not do I encourage it.

Coming out is a long process I have worked on for over two years, and I believe I have some way to go yet. Mr. Slattery readily admitted that coming out took over 5 years for him. I think he would have suffered a great deal if that process had been compacted into one day. I know I would. People sit beside me in classes, party with me in the dorms and even share a room in the dorm with me, not knowing I am gay. This does not bother me. For I make no attempts to hide. Nor do I introduce my boyfriend at parties, though we hang out constantly and everyone who knows me, knows him.

I have told the people close to me, including family and friends. I am not locked in anyone's closet. I have been careful in choosing who I tell, only telling those who I believe to be in a need to know situation. I feel no need whatsoever to scream it loudly from the nearest rooftop for all the campus to hear.

The lack of this desire on my part

has nothing to do with the idea that I fear repercussions, I don't. It has nothing to do with fables about embarrassment, I wouldn't be. It is simply nobody else's business but mine.

As for the artsy-liberalist mentality that it is my social responsibility to come out of the closet, I think not. The vast majority of people who know me, and who are important in my life, know the real me.

Whether or not I hold a position of importance within the student body of this school, should have no bearing on the fact that I choose to keep my private life private. So if the people who do know about me, choose to "OUT" me, then I believe they have achieved nothing more than to take one step in simply doing what the homophobic world would love: Gay Community Self Destruction.

If gays go around outing each other, this 'tattling' causes us to appear for more divided than together. The person who is outed does nothing to further the cause afterward; they feel betrayed by a movement that they may have joined one day. Regardless, outing is generally a flash in the pan response to homophobia, and causes little social change. Most people take note with a gasp followed by, "Well what do you know." And all is forgotten two minutes later.

A far better alternative - is trying to help people out of the closet at their own pace. For those who do not wish to come out - so be it. A person who comes out, famous or not, on their own, can soon become a force within the gay rights movement without being pushed in or out of anything.

Frankly, I see some straight people around this campus drooling at the mouth over outing - because they will hear who is gay locally versus hearing rumors about Richard Chamberlain in the *Enquirer* or *Star* as Mr. Slattery suggested. Frankly, the *National Enquirer* and outing have little in common except for the fact that more often than not, the two base their information on hearsay, and rumor.

Outing - is a dangerous practice in the wrong hands. The potential for mistakes, and the potential for out with malice, are far too great. In my opinion, too great for this to be used a useful weapon against homophobia.

I think Mr. Slattery's opinions are dangerous as well. If we are encouraged to publicize private matters, just because they are true, and just because we feel it would further causes, then should we all be made aware of AIDS carriers on campus; first, last and middle name, with an address? I think not.

I don't believe that straight people are wary of outing because they don't want to hear about the gay population. I think that is a paranoid, nay almost militant opinion. Surely some fit that description, but I think overall, one could not make such a generalization. I am gay, and I don't think outing is a good idea. Even though, I am on my way out.

It is my belief the best weapon against homophobia, are confident strong individuals, who come out at their own pace and when out, are able to show the world that they are effectively no different than before, only more open; more comfortable with the real person within.

This will, over time, being the lasting social justice we all desire and -

Continued on page 15

deserve.

** I realize the anonymous point under fire, but I am from an anonymous will force people "Do I know this picture he is gay?" Name withheld

Get It Right

Dear Sir,

I am writing response to the weeks issue depicting the scene from Canada. I know is, who is the person that has the last time I visited (God's country) amalgamated so picture on the cover paper showing Quebec. For you is a section of Canada of Newfoundland. If I do recall not for this province Meech Lake and discriminatory passed. I think the premier of Newfoundland excellent political valid objections support him one why would Labrador of Newfoundland with Quebec is reason why Quebec accord. I thought Canadians are j players. At least about another brains who put weeks Brunswick geography of the complete ignorance person or person appalling act of other Labrador here (who share and reprint this appropriate correction in geography.

PS I apologize to students for the story