

Editorial shockingly poor

Dear Unsigned Editor:

In my many years of reading the *Brunswickan*, I have never been as shocked by its poor quality, as I was upon reading the February 8th front page editorial. Such a piece of hack journalism would probably never make the back page of the *National Enquirer*. That such a poorly written and ill thought out article was placed on the front page was a crime in itself; that the writer didn't have the guts to sign it was plain cowardice.

The writer, and I use that term loosely, has chosen to climb on the media persecution bandwagon instead of lending his/her 'talent' to problems closer to the University and its students. Richard Hatfield, in my opinion, has abused his office in much more serious ways than his alleged use of recreational drugs. The enrolment of this University has been climbing for years; the provincial funding has been declining for years. This is the issue that the *Brunswickan* should take the Premier to task on—not drugs.

If you insist on attacking the court proceedings, the comments of Judge Harrigan are what must be deemed as irresponsible. We are not in Libya; what many know to be the truth cannot be proven beyond a reasonable doubt in court, and consequently Hatfield must be, and rightfully so, found not guilty.

You say you want equal treatment for all—fine. Let's follow you around on a Saturday night and then, without sufficient evidence to charge you, tell the world, via the press, some juicy details about your private life. If that is the equality you desire, you're welcome to it. In conclusion, let's see some quality from this paper, look for important and relevant news instead of following odious trends. We do need more money you know! And if you insist on writing and publishing such articles—sign them. Don't be ashamed of your convictions.

Gladly signed,
Peter Rowan

...and into the Fryer

Dear Editor:

In last week's editorial, you are critical of the 8 SRC councillors who voted not to approve a motion rejecting the Board of Governor's report on the SUB. As one of those 8, I would like to defend my position at the time. Like most councillors, I did not get my copy of the BOG report until 5 minutes before the meeting. There was not even time to

understand it. While my initial reaction to the report was negative, I was not ready to vote for a motion to "condemn and utterly reject" the report, and call it an "emaciated" board. A less strongly worded motion I would have abstained from voting on until I had a better grasp of the issue, but this motion I felt was out of line as I doubt more than a handful of councillors had even read the whole report before voting to condemn it.

Furthermore, I wonder how much good it does to "utterly reject" the report. Such motions I feel are easily ignored by the administration. Surely more effective would be a motion expressing exactly which aspects of the report are acceptable and which are unacceptable and why. It is unfortunate that so many councillors would rather pass a superficial motion sure to grab the headlines than take the time and effort to approve something more detailed and constructive.

Jeff Fryer
Graduate Student Rep.

FLAG ad misunderstood

Dear Editor:

I wish to respond to Mr., Mrs., Ms.,?? Conscientious Reader who vigorously opposes the running of the ad regarding homosexuality. It seems that Conscientious Reader opposes the ad because of the way in which it is presented. Conscientious feels the ad exemplifies the homosexual lifestyle as "attractive" and "desirable."

I fail to understand how Conscientious can interpret this from an ad that is simply designed to assist individuals who are either "confused, curious, worried, sympathetic to, or proud of, "their sexual preference. Personally, I see no undertones of promised sexual experimentation nor can I picture a room of homosexual leeches waiting to attach themselves to the poor, unsuspecting individual. Do you think these people are merely out after new meat? How ridiculous of me to assume they may be some sort of support or counselling group; no, they definitely must be communist brainwashers attempting to convert the sexually insecure.

After stating the only opposition to the ad was its presentation, Conscientious goes on to relieve herself/himself of their personal opinions which are irrelevant to the main opposition. If you find the ad offensive, may I suggest you discuss a possible revision or alternative idea with the person who wrote it.

You say, Conscientious, that the "activity" should not be publicized or encouraged. Do you think that by keeping

away? You can push it as far back in the closet as you like but the fact is, it will still be there. You can encourage homosexuality or anything else for that matter, all you like, but people will make up their own minds. If someone encourages you to do something you don't want to, obviously you will not do it. Clearly you have a low opinion of the masses' mental capacity to decide for themselves.

Your personal views (which I have already stated as insignificant to your original opposition) are downright amusing. You begin by giving Biblical references that term homosexuality as "blasphemous," "shameless," and a "capital offense," and then proceed to tell us not to take this as an attack. What is one to take it as? If it has something to do with the presentation of the ad, please reveal it.

I am also curious as to what your "distorted nature" that I am supposed to be sharing in is.

I truly enjoyed your prophetic view of the world if homosexuality were accepted and widely practiced. If you sincerely believe that the entire population will become homosexual if the above criteria are met, then you are very paranoid individual. I'm sure that the billions of people on our planet are not waiting for the moment when they can spring out of the closet. If you want to worry about the human race becoming non-existent, I think you had better worry about nuclear war which probably has a better chance of occurring and wiping out the population than homosexuality has.

Homosexuality is a problem. It is a problem because of people like you who stick their noses in other people's business. What two *consenting adults* do in the privacy of their own home is of no concern to you or me or anyone else for that matter. Society has the right to step in only if homosexuality poses a threat to the public's well-being, i.e. pornography, molestation, rape etc.. Also in the case of the mentally infirm or the young who are not capable to choose for themselves.

I think that in running the said argument, the *Brunswickan* is not ignoring any code of ethics it may have but rather your code of ethics.

I do realize that everyone has a right to their opinion. However, when you begin an argument that concerns only the presentation of the ad, and proceed to forget this premise and spend the rest of your argument relating personal views, nothing is established. Even the use of the word presentation is not clear. By using presentation are you referring to the mere presence of the ad in the paper or do you mean the presentation of the ad in terms of how it is assembled

and what it is trying to say? After reading your argument, it seems to me anyway that you are upset with the way the ad is written.

Because your argument is not clear I may have misunderstood the point you were trying to make. I would very much like for you to respond to clarify your objective.

Rachel Valcourt

Homosexuality a "non-issue"

Dear Editor:

This letter is in response to the issues raised about homosexuality in last week's *Brunswickan*. We are shocked and frustrated with the prevailing attitude regarding homosexuality on campus.

First we feel that the question asked in Viewpoint was inappropriate and unfair. The students are never asked about the other advertisements in the *Brunsw.* Drinking and loud music may be offensive to some people, but the Social Club and various other pubs advertise regularly. Counselling Services are not of interest to everyone, yet they advertise. Other organizations such as WORD deal with issues that not everyone agrees with or adheres to, yet the *Brunsw.* runs their ads weekly.

In response to the person who wrote the religion-oriented letter to the editor, we beg you to argue on more valid grounds. We believe that the religious argument against homosexuality is one that depends entirely on your interpretation of the Bible. Furthermore, since one of us is not religious, my argument with you would be one of whether I should believe in God (since I don't think there is a God to tell me whether or not I should be gay). The other of us is very religious, and feels that her lifestyle is no more sinful than the Christian who takes the Pill, or gets divorced.

Basically, we feel that homosexuality is a "non-issue." It is a lifestyle which some people choose and not others. It is not a disease and it is not contagious. By increasing public awareness through communication and education, we can only hope to dispel the myths about homosexuality which create fear and perpetuate the ignorant viewpoints raised in last week's *Brunsw.*

We realize that this is a small, conservative, civil-service town with small conservative ideas about homosexuality. However, this town also houses a university with hundreds of gay students. We feel that it's incredibly important for the student population (and the newspaper which represents those students) to be more open-minded and understanding of the issue of

homosexuality. We can only do this by breaking down the barriers and by being more accepting of each other's lifestyle.

Signed,
2 concerned students.

Learning from the Good Book

Dear Brunswickan:

I would like to take the opportunity to reply to the naive outpourings of the "conscientious reader" of last week's edition. While I do realize that the Bible, on which the author's argument was based, is a reasonable piece of mythology-cum-history, I would never choose to base any argument of substance on the ramblings of ill-educated, itinerant tribespeople. The so-called factual basis of the Bible is derived from its supposed representation of the word of God. How anyone could believe such sedition in this day and age is beyond me.

However, if the original protagonist is prepared to use the book of Leviticus to back up his/her argument concerning homosexuality I would accept the point only if he/she accepted the other laws and rules which are explicitly stated in the same book. How about the one stating that women are unclean for seven days following menstruation? Or the one about not eating pigs, hares, vultures, rock-badgers, and other assorted wildlife? Or the punishment of adultery by death? I'm sure the author would carry out those rules as stringently as the one concerning homosexuality. After all aren't they all the "word of God?"

Finally I would like to point out the obvious discrepancies which exist in the Bible. When rules exist, they exist only to be broken if by so doing the resultant action aids in perpetuation of the patriarchal line. Witness the God-approved attempt at daughter-prostitution by Lot in the book of Genesis, or the later incestuous undertakings between Lot and the same two daughters, all for patriarchal reasons. Not even to mention the vast numbers of gay couples contained within the covers of the illustrious book — David and Jonathan, Martha and Mary, even Jesus and his "beloved" disciple John.

So please don't talk about the Bible as an ultimate reference source. It is a mass of contradiction and why it has been revered for so long is quite beyond belief. I won't sign this note for fear of retribution, not from any God on high, but more from the self-blinded henchmen/women who exist in abundance on this small and retrograde campus.

Yours in Christ (!)

Name withheld upon request