

## More letters to the editor

of missiles in the form of empty beer bottles, stones, eggs, etc. was hurled at the windows, some finding their mark others going astray. Needless to say this might have resulted in serious injury to those within the office and succeeded in temporarily defacing the building.

On observing this group of cretins fraught with the desire to do wanton damage, we placed a telephone call to the security police. The first phone call failed to waken them to the possible seriousness of the incident. Returning to the scene of the action and finding this rowdy group engaged in further puerile activity, we hastened to the phone once again.

A second call produced no further result other than the corporal's reassurance that "Our men are on the job." Certainly, if they were on the job they were either afraid of being hit by missiles or preferred to remain safe and warm within the building. If this had been an orderly and non-violent protest no doubt the security officers would have been there to apprehend the 'criminals' and carry out their rather distorted concept of justice.

A group of faculty members happening on the scene succeeded in dispersing the group, performing the job the security police are being paid for.

Having been members of this university for the past two years, we have found this to be only one instance indicative of the incompetence of the security officers. Any other remarks would be anticlimactic, other than the expression of our appreciation for allowing us to vent our emotions in a rectitudinal manner.

Edward McGoldrick  
Dana Flanagan  
Arts 2

More broad-mindedness, please

Editor:

I am writing to the Brunswickan at this time to comment on your Oct. 29 editorial (The war rattles on . . .) concerning

the war in Vietnam, and to offer some thoughts that have been bypassed in your spiel. You follow a thoroughly one-sided and exaggerated line of thinking particularly exemplified by your concluding paragraph. In your second editorial, you go on to berate the Daily Gleaner for its editorializing, particularly as it questions the aims of SDS. You seem to lose sight of the fact that the Gleaner is a commercial paper depending on wide circulation. If people do not like the Gleaner's content they can simply pass up buying it, unlike the Brunswickan where all students have already paid for it. A little more broad-mindedness on your part, both in editorial and news content, would be appreciated.

Your editorial on the war has, in the view of many, if not most at UNB, missed the mark on several counts. You attribute the war entirely to the U.S., forgetting that it takes two sides to fight a war. Who was in South Vietnam first, the northern forces or the Americans? If the conflict in South Vietnam were purely a civil non-China affair between Saigon and the Viet Cong, you would indeed have a point in your editorial. But such is not the case. The Americans are in the south because of a treaty arrangement with Saigon to protect the country against the infiltration of men and arms from the north, backed up by China. The insistence that the U.S. has spent billions of dollars and sent tens of thousands of men to Vietnam to gain imperialist control over a country of a few million peasants (as you call them) lies somewhere between extremely ludicrous and somewhat infantile.

To attempt an analysis of the Paris peace talks would be fruitless for anyone at this point. It cannot be said with certainty what is going on there, and speculation is worthless. However the whole business can be seen as an attempt by the U.S. to reach an agreement on ending hostilities. The north and the Viet Cong have many times gone on record as calling for a

complete military victory for their side. Has this line softened? If not, who in all honesty should be blamed for continuing the war? We hear today and have heard many times in the past, of Communist shellings of

Saigon. These presumably are terror tactics, and result in death and injury to many innocent people. What of these developments, Mr. editor? Are these the acts of Vietnamese peasants who farm, love one another and seek peace, as you imply? Or are they representative of tactics employed by brutal, bloodthirsty animals who stop at nothing to gain an edge? This consideration alone should end your grief when they are shot and napalmed in the act of carrying on their terrorism.

As for your contention that socialism is not a world-wide and united conspiracy, few people were advancing any notion that it ever was. The theory was that the Communist movement was such a conspiracy. Any Marxist worth his salt has to profess that communism (a Marxian concept) is international and must triumph on a global scale before mankind can enjoy the fruits of Utopia. While the international Communist movement may presently be divided concerning the means, the end is most certainly the same. Those in Moscow and other cities who may want the dictatorship of the proletariat to live forever are not true Marxists and live up to the Red Chinese epithet of 'revisionists'. Rest assured that these same Red Chinese, largely responsible for the unrest and war in Vietnam, really do want to capture the world for Communism. You needn't take my word for it. Listen to the Red Guards sometime.

It is hoped that this letter will help to remove confusion on your part, and let the readers get a different view of events. Your own prejudices and biases have no place in the Brunswickan, despite any presupposed superior intellect and judgement. This is the students' paper, not yours.

Andrew Aalund  
Bus. Admin. 2

## Pink and Grey

Charles W. Brown

This morning I get up at eleven and I am dazed so I can think of only the most common fourletterwords to express that I have once again missed bounteous McConnell Hall breakfast but have not slept till noon when I could get lunch at once after the regulation halfhour appetite period in the line. So I got to have a shower with deliberately bright expression on face which fools no one because the eyes are far too wide open because otherwise they'd shut and it does not fool Healthy type who is in the washroom and who looks like a forester who chops down trees before breakfast and I know he sees through me that I am decadent and lazy and in Arts and he is right and probably he is actually in Arts too because we're not all like that. But once I have shaved I love the world and me included and I realise I am possibly avant-garde and maybe if I tell the inpeople I am protesting social conformity in sleeping-hours they will be impressed but probably not.

In the Coughyteria I look arrogantly over all the tables to see if there are any inpeople for I do not want to be found by them when they come in sitting with obvious reactionaries unless of course they are Important Reactionaries when it will be obvious I am being very subtle and I will be approved of except by some people in 130 who will never approve of me anyhow. But the only people I know are wearing red jackets and I can't risk talking to them here even if they are my friends so I sit on my own and I study the leaflet I picked up at the door which tells me the SRC should be work- not word-oriented and if I Vote for Clean I'll be In the Mainstream. And I feel deep humility because all my education has been word-oriented and I think gloomily it was good high-school English grades got me into college and of course I now realise this was Wrong because it is typical of the decadent unhealthy preoccupations of subversive leftist elements that are trying to destroy our society and I gain a profound insight into how I lose all round and I feel Seen Through.

And Jabberwocky has joined me and I offer him a cancerette and complain why am I not a real radical and I was at the Bore-doff Governors Meeting demonstration (because I knew Jabberwocky is a real revolutionary yet he says he has rightist friends and I wonder if I am one) and I say all I got was a blasting from my Dean and not martyrdom and he says not to worry and offers me a coffee which shows I have some radical friends at least. And then Charles De comes in and I can see he is worried that something may be going wrong in the SRC offices while he is absent and I realise power is a great burden and I admire men who are content to do all the work without wanting the glory of office and I feel inferior.

And I look round the Coughyteria and see some Authentic Radicals gathered and they look genuine and I think I will go and sit on the fringe and then I remember I do not have a maxiposter of Che Guevera on my wall only photographs of places I have been which is bourgeois and antique prints which is elitist and I feel too guilty to speak to them and anyway I have to go to a lecture to be spoonfed by a professor that I admire mainly for his political abilities and that shows I am really perverted. Because I should be telling him he is unliberated and has sould his birth-right to Colinwhitey or something and I tell myself firmly the real reason I don't is that I am a student nigger and a budding Uncle Tom and all my ideas about good manners are just a rationalisation. So I will be very brave and take no notes and look superior to the other slaves and will look him straight in the eye with an expression of revolutionary disdain and probably he will ask if I am not feeling well and I will read it all up in the book afterwords for the exam because I can't afford to go to Rochdale and anyway I like the trees.

# VIEWPOINT

## What would be a good topic for Viewpoint?



teddy weiner  
-prof:

"Civil disorder or dialogue?"



brian magnusson:  
arts 2

"Would you believe that Colin B. is really the Great Pumpkin?"



pat cameron,  
science 3

What should be done about air pollution?



jenifer spivey,  
education 3

Do you think Christianity is relevant today?

lynne swift,  
pe 2

"How many push-ups do you think an arts-man can do?"

jackie violette,  
arts 3

"Do you think that we are getting a real education at U.N.B.?"

john blackie,  
arts 4

"Do you think U.N.B. students are bare-faced and backwards?"

jerry vovles,  
arts 1

"SEX"