

# 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.

## Stop using old excuses

Dear Editor:

It was disappointing to see in our school paper the suggestion that a woman would be less suitable candidate for a job due to her capacity for becoming pregnant. People have been using this excuse for centuries to limit the freedoms and role of women in society, yet fertility is just one aspect of a woman; it should not define her whole self.

There are many reasons why any man might not also have been a suitable choice. What if our man had had a heart attack or been in an accident? Should we not hire smokers because they may get lung disease, or not hire older, overweight men with Type A personalities because they may have heart attacks? We can see just how ridiculous the suggestion that a woman's fertility should limit her opportunities begins to look, especially when we remember that many a woman may not be trying or even be able to have children for the greater part of her life.

Society needs to take advantage to the fullest the talents of all its members. Fortunately, employers are finally starting to recognize that to be competitive they need to hire women as well as men - and that sometimes the best man for the job is a she. The suggestion that a woman's fertility should limit her opportunities is an affront both to the women studying here on campus and to the men who support our choice.

Nicole Gallant

## Upset with lack of concern for Bruns female staff

Dear Editor,

An open letter to the UNB Student Women's Collective and Allan Carter, Editor of *the Brunswickan*.

A few months ago we sent a letter to the Women's Collective outlining our concerns that a convicted Sexual Harasser was working at *the Brunswickan* as a regular contributor.

We received no response from the Collective about our concerns, however, it seems that the Collective is too busy harassing professors to concern themselves with real threats to women's safety in the UNB student's work place.

We are very upset with *the Brunswickan's* lack of concern for their women staff members safety. Mr. Carter is aware of who we are speaking of and yet has done nothing to restrict this person's access to the female staff members of *the Brunswickan*.

As for the UNB Student Women's Collective, we are very disappointed that they have not taken action. The Collective often writes high and mighty articles about other oppressed groups of women, but meanwhile a real crisis for women is occurring right under their noses.

We both know what this person is capable of so we ask Mr. Carter to get some respect for his employees and do something about the

situation.

The UNB Women's Collective should concern itself with more pressing matters than the harassment of professors that it believes are against women's interests.

Thank you.  
Andrew Williamson  
Carolyn Smith

## A response to Andrew and Carol

Dear Andrew and Carol:

I would like to respond to your recent letter criticizing the Wimmin's Collective for not taking any action on your concerns expressed in a letter dated Oct. 26, 1992 about a sexual harasser working for *the Brunswickan*. After I received your initial letter in October I met with Allan Carter, editor-in-chief of *the Bruns*. At that time he assured me that the man you found guilty of harassing your girlfriend when they both worked at CHSR-FM was not working for *the Bruns*.

At the time Allan and I spoke, this man had only written one article for *the Bruns* and was not considered a staff member and the article was considered a one time contribution. Several weeks passed and this man did not write again. It was not until near the end of last term (the last three issues of the paper I believe) that this man started writing again. I again spoke to Allan about the situation and he was as concerned about it as I was. Because we were so near the end of term and it was a very hectic time, Allan decided to let it go until the new year.

One of the things Allan and I spoke about is the problem of there being nothing to prevent a student who has been found guilty of sexual harassment from moving from one student organization to another. The women at *the Bruns* have all been made aware of the situation for their own protection and this man will not be given any positions of power. We realize that this is not a great solution - but it is the best Allan could do for now. As a result of this situation *the Bruns* is now looking at developing their own sexual harassment policy.

Unfortunately, the way our society works, aggressors often have more protection and rights than their victims. Just like there is nothing to stop wife beaters from finding new victims, there is nothing to stop sexual harassers from harassing again. People would much rather pretend the whole thing never happened, or they do not want to believe a man they know could be abusive because he was "always nice to me."

Another problem is that the details of this particular case are strictly confidential. Allan has not even been able to read the file so he is only getting one side of the story. There are also professors on this campus who have repeatedly been reported for sexual harassment, yet their names are never made public.

I also feel I owe you an apology

for not getting back to you. As you know, shit kind of hit the fan for me at the end of last term and I was also in the middle of organizing the Christmas Match Program. However, I should have at least phoned to tell you that I had received your letter and that I had met with Allan. Also, I initially thought that the situation had been dealt with and assumed that was the end of it.

I am sorry if you feel the Wimmin's Collective did not take your concerns seriously, but I assure you that is not the case. We take all concerns seriously, whether we cause a public uproar or handle the matter privately.

Yours truly,  
Valerie Kilfoil  
UNB Student Wimmin's Collective

*Ed Note: I wish to assure Andrew Williamson and Carolyn Smith that I have spoken to the female staff members who work with the individual in question and any concerns that they have about the individual are being addressed. Presently, the Brunswickan is in the process of implementing a sexual harassment policy. Further, the editorial board has decided to ask members of the UNB sexual harassment committee to give a presentation on sexual harassment at a staff meeting that all staff members are expected to attend. All parties involved are aware of the situation and the Bruns is determined that no occurrences of sexual harassment take place*

## Star Trek review an insult

Dear Editor,

I feel compelled to respond to your review in the 15th issue of *The Brunswickan* of the new Star Trek series "Deep Space Nine". First of all, I should say that you insulted many people, Trekers and Non-Trekers alike, by your terminology, specifically the term "GEEKS". No one likes to be called a geek.

I should inform you that aside from being one of the most popular television shows in television history, most of the followers of this phenomenon are very well respected professionals in their communities. As well, there is a large population of Trekers here on campus.

It is obvious to myself, and virtually everyone who watched the premier of Deep Space Nine, that you did not watch and/or listen closely to the show. First, Sisko's rank is commander, not captain; he was never even called captain. Next, the Federation had nothing to do with the building of the space station, they only took over the administration of it after the Cardassians left their occupation of Bajor. Next, recall that the worm hole is artificiality generated by the beings that live their non-linear existence within. Also, you missed entirely the reason for Sisko's blackmail of Quark, which was to get him, as an original member of the community, to stay in order to help regenerate the station's community.

I could go on explaining to such an unenlightened person as your-

self, all of your inaccurate, illogical, unsubstantiated and foolish insults—such as not even researching the names, or spellings, of the two actors who played Chekov and Uhura, or not allowing for time to get the series up and running to find out the histories and proper introduction of some characters—but as you your self say, why bother?

Live Long and Prosper.

Michael Brooks

P.S. I offer \$40.00 Canadian for your brother's tunic, if it fits me, but I already have my own communicator.

## Homosexuality: Lesson number two

Dear Editor:

O.K. kids. Lecture number two about homosexuality. But first I would like to say a little about hypocrisy.

It has been said that my letter last week was hypocritical. I spoke of "coming out" and yet did not sign my name. I also said that the coming out process does not require you to announce it to everyone. It is not my wish for everyone on campus to know that I am gay, for that is unnecessary. There is no need for me to publicize it. That letter was **not** my coming out speech. Nuff said. Now on to this week...

In 1948, a man named Alfred Kinsey conducted a study on sexual preference. He surveyed hundreds of people and his results were quite different from what we traditionally think about sexuality: it is not black and white. He placed one's sexual preference on a scale of zero to seven - zero being people who consider themselves exclusively heterosexual and seven being people who consider themselves exclusively homosexual. He discovered that most people *do not* place themselves at either zero or seven.

Why is this important, you ask? Imagine a society where people were unafraid to acknowledge the presence of "grey areas" in their sexuality - areas that we all secretly know to exist. Prejudice on the basis of sexual orientation, as we presently see it, would be much less epidemic. I believe prejudice, in this sense, to arise partly as a result of one person's dislike for grey areas within himself/herself that he/she sees as being incompatible with the perceived norms of society. Why else would one man hate another simply on the basis of who the other chooses to love? I would ask all of you who have feelings of dislike for gay men and women to ask yourself that question.

When I hear other men saying how much they would like to physically harm gay people and how much they disagree with homosexuality, I stop to wonder just how many of these same people secretly have had, at one time or another, homosexual thoughts and/or desires. Scary, isn't it? But tragic too. Because if so many of us (women included) fall into this grey area of sexuality, and so many people who

claim to be "totally straight" have been involved in either fantasies or experiences involving people of the same sex, then again I ask why is homosexuality persecuted so much?

My challenge this week is not for the gay individual, but for the non-gay person. Take a look at your own secret thoughts. No need to tell anyone what strange things you have thought about. But if, at some time, you have ever been doubtful about your own sexuality (or continue to be) then think about that the next time you consider telling a cruel fag joke, or calling some guy in our dorm a queer. I know it's just as hard for the non-gay person to change his/her attitude about homosexuality as it is for a gay person to come to terms with his/her new identity. It is the responsibility of non-gay people to overcome their insecurities and/or prejudice just as it is necessary for a gay person to "come out of the closet." Ask yourself these questions:

- 1) Why do I dislike gay people?
- 2) What would I do if a friend told me he/she was gay?
- 3) Is any negative action I would take fair to them?

Simple questions. Not so simple answers, I suspect. Perhaps even better than asking yourself those questions would be to ask questions to another gay person. What is it like being gay? When did you first realize that you were different? Do your parents know? How did they react? Why do you feel someone is gay? Is it a choice you made? What are gay relationships like? How (if, in fact they do) do they differ from non-gay relationships? What is your interpretation of "gay rights?"

More than anything, you run the risk of realizing that we are more or less just like you - we laugh, we cry, we hurt, we go to class or work... we are human.

signed,  
The Bakery Boy

## Questions not answered

Dear Editor:

On January 8, *The Brunswickan* published two Opinion columns and a long letter, and another letter on January 15, in response to my Opinion column of Dec. 4, 1992, which was entitled "Holocaust denial." But none of the writers has answered my question as to what is meant by the holocaust denial, or how was the Canadian Immigration justified in deporting Mr. David Irving.

The three Jewish student writers have been rude and verbose in an attempt to create a hateful impression about me. Here are some of their adverbs and adjectives: "Disgusted", "Appalled", "Blatant anti-Semitic drivel", "Hate literature", "Despicable", "Twisted", "Shocked", "Hateful opinion", "Ignorant", "Semi-coherent rant",

Continued on page 7