

Issue 6 **editorial**
BY MACK MORGAN

Welcome back UNB Alumni from various parts of the country. I hear people as far away as Regent Street are making it back for Homecoming 95.

This Thursday to Sunday marks UNB's inaugural Homecoming. Homecoming, it seems to me, has developed out of the "American University" tradition. What makes a university of 200 years plus decide to wake up one morning and go "Homecoming?"

I anticipate the alumni are geared up for the big football game, the selection of the homecoming queen and the "revelries." I know I would be too if they existed. Oh yeah, it seems the Red Bombers went the way of the Dodo, the Homecoming queen is another example of men's objectification of women and "revelries" won't be found that readily on campus.

Homecoming is organised as a way to promote harmony between faculty, staff, alumni and, or course, the students - to gather in one great campfire to share the UNB experience.

I can tell you the Administration cares about the alumni but more so, loves financially successful alumni. Homecoming now provides the Administration with ample opportunity to add to their Venture Campaign coffers. Administration will salivate with anticipation at alumni's return each year, with empty hands extended like a bellhop itching for a tip.

Homecoming coordinates several events for the alumni to partake in while in town. The reasoning behind this is so alumni will only have to make one trip to UNB during the course of a year - saves them and UNB money.

Maybe it might surprise a few of the alumni to know that UNB's students and faculty have grown apathetic but I doubt it. A case in point for example: a Million Man March at UNB usually turns up about enough people to form a smoker's corner. It is not due to lack of planning (maybe lack of publicity) but due to apathetic students treating their education like the digestive system. "Eat me, do your magic then let me out to swim."

People do try and make the university a better place but sometime it feels like they want more money or do not want to pay more money. Nobody really rallies for pride anymore, hopefully the Administration will give everyone back a chance to rally for spirit before hitting them up for a donation.

Students should take heed, if you see a few "experienced" persons long in tooth, sit down and share your favourite UNB story and I am sure they will share their's with you.

So once again, welcome back alumni and enjoy your stay. It is going to be a great time. Check out Oktoberfest and the bevy of Sporting activities but most of all, go out and meet your old friends.

On a lighter note, what I cannot fathom is why someone who spent so much time and money at UNB would want to come back. I am joking. Maybe.

I
N
W
H
I
C
H
N
E
I
L
G
E
T
S
W
O
R
K
E
D
U
P
O
V
E
R
S
O
M
E
S
M
A
L
L
T
R
I
V
I
A
L
I
T
Y
(
Y
E
T
A
G
A
I
N
)

The Mugwump Journal

Apparently English, is an amazingly versatile language, capable of carrying a multitude of messages at the same time. Or at least that's what one of my friends who spends a lot more time around the English department than I do said. I was shocked. To begin with, it made the language sound like some kind of phone network. And then it all started to come back to me - high school, blackboards, onomatopoeia, alliteration, criticism. After all these years of bludgeoning the language to make it convey crisp accurate details in technical reports, it was a surprise to rediscover it's hidden side.

Further encouraged, I went looking for examples of this refined usage. I tried to read "Tiger Tiger" again. Failed miserably though. Loathed the refinement as much as I did the first time, it just didn't get to the point. But still, maybe I was aiming just a little too high for a first attempt. So I persevered, and slowly I started to see the light, as some of the layers of symbolism were peeled away to reveal the true message.

And then came that fateful day, when this whole new world crumbled around me. The question seemed so innocuous at the time.

"So, you and _____, I mean, So, are you friends...or friends?"

It was only later that the deeper meaning of this hit me. The realisation that for all of the symbolisation and the allegories and the metaphors that this fabulous language of ours wasn't being used to it's full potential. Certainly, there are those who attempt to craft prose with it, others who write for people to read what they haven't written, but there still remains the ugly truth that this isn't what society really wants. Now what society really wants is a nice, safe, well designed category to throw you into. Stereotype seems to be another word that fits the bill rather well.

You don't believe me? When was the last time you had a friend you could have been attracted to without being asked *that* question. Doesn't happen (well it doesn't to me - but maybe I just have a bad reputation). And sadly, this is just the tip of the iceberg. Go on, tell me that you only assume that a jock plays sports, or that a slacker is someone who takes their time about things.

George Orwell speculated that language would decrease by eliminating words which duplicate each other. For example good, minus, plus and double could be used to express opinion through all ranges of positives and negatives. Now we have these fabulous stereotypes, eliminating the need for all those defining words. Now we can just say grunge - no need for noisy, twisted, rock influenced by the city of Seattle. Perhaps the size of language won't decrease but keep increasing with ever growing numbers of these (eventually) definitionless words.

Neil Duxbury

Blood in the Thunder



The Abortion Debate becoming a War Zone

To the Editor:

The recent fiftieth anniversaries of the atomic bombings prompted debates about the ethics of warfare. Meanwhile, the war on prenatal children raged on unabated, routinely trashing every ethical principle. It has consisted exclusively of literally surgical first strikes against the totally innocent and helpless, intended to preempt the recognition and protections normally accorded at birth. Rather than honour the immunity of non-combatants, it has deliberately targeted them. It has employed poisonous weapons, refusal of quarter and live dismemberment the unarmed target population, even subjecting them to experimentation, in contravention of the laws of war and all international standards for the treatment of prisoners. It has violated "Just War" principles, including just cause, last resort, proportionality and competent authority by placing the decision for a death-dealing act, grotesquely disproportionate to the ends usually sought, in the hands of the frequently ill-informed, distraught and underage. It's rationalisation on the basis of so-called hard cases has reduced the vast majority of those slaughtered to collateral damage at rates that would be morally horrendous if practised by the military.

What is it about unborn babies that suspends every ethical consideration? Is it the lack of any non-violent alternative for retaining control that justifies all manner of barbarism? Or is it that once the mental process of devaluing the lives of others, born or unborn, has gone far enough, they cease to exist in our minds as human beings such that anything can be done to them? What have we become that we avert our eyes as nearly one in every three of our children is destroyed? Is this imbalance of power so much to be feared? Why has the propaganda campaign been so effective that many now think and speak in the euphemisms ("pro-choice", "abortion rights") of the language of denial? How much more violence to life, truth, language, values, law, government, medicine, ethics and the principles of human rights can civilisation withstand? But conscience and nature are not

easily overcome. Like the flyers who delivered the bombs, the women who have delivered their unborn babies to the killing centres have suffered unforeseen fallout, experiencing a range of emotional and physical problems from guilt and depression to sterility and breast cancer. Yet war planners continue to resist providing even the most basic safeguards - such as information about human development, life-affirming alternatives and potential hazards - rightly fearful that piercing their veil of ignorance will render their proxies unwilling to continue the carnage.

Alfred Lemmo

Netiquette for Editorial and Mugwump Journal

To the Editor:

In response to last week's editorials on the merits of the Internet and its users, I would like to address a couple of Mr Morgan's and Mr Duxbury's ideas that seemed to leap off the page.

First of all, your assertion that "other students sitting next to users of questionable material should not feel uncomfortable or harassed by the images or text on the screen next to them" misses the point. The tricky thing about harassment is that it is in the eye of the beholder. That is, essentially only the victim can attest to whether they feel uncomfortable or harassed, although the consequences for the "perpetrator" will still be left up to the powers that be.

Unfortunately, your beliefs, or anyone else's, as to how someone should feel when confronted with pornographic images in a public place, are unlikely to be of much comfort to a person who becomes genuinely upset by such material.

Secondly, the university might rightly take issue with your suggestion that student fees give people the right to use university resources for what you said yourself are frivolous activities. I know that if I had an essay to print out and found myself in a lineup for a computer and saw someone downloading those ever-popular Cindy Crawford pics, I'd feel justified, as another fee-paying student, in complaining to CSD.

To Mr Duxbury, man of the overworked metaphor: keep in mind

that any such association will only go so far. Of course, surfing the 'net is not literally surfing - how long did it take you to figure that one out?

The Internet, even with the amazing amount of trivial material online, has a potential that should not be underestimated. Many of us have learned how to change the channel when a stupid TV program comes on - the same selective ability will likely develop, with practice, for the Internet user.

For anyone who has ever wondered what it was like when our parents and grandparents got their first television or telephone, consider this: the World Wide Web is our generation's opportunity to witness the genesis of a powerful new communication tool. Take it for what it is, and if you'd really rather be surfing, no one's stopping you.

Mary Rogal-Black

IS can't be friends to both Aborigines and Separatists

Dear Editor:

I wonder if anyone else caught the irony in the appearance of Nik Carrier's letter ("October Crisis 25 Years Later and the Debate continues") in the *The Brunswickan's* October 13 issue. Carrier expressed fear that the Quebecois, if they voted to separate from Canada, would be victims of military force from this "oppressive federal state". On the same day the letter appeared, *The Telegraph-Journal* reported that Quebec Cree leader Matthew Coon-Come feared that, in the event of separation, the Quebec government would use force to quell discontent among natives.

Coon-Come's statement deals with an issue that Carrier completely ignores. Jacques Parizeau has said that Quebec's borders are inviolable in the event of separation. Yet much of Quebec's Northern Territory is land that was granted to the province by the Federal Government after Confederation. What's more, the native people of this territory, who, in reality, have more claim to it than Quebec does, have overwhelmingly opposed Quebec sovereignty. Carrier's fellow socialists claim to be in solidarity with aboriginal, but his letter inherently expressed