

**THE
BRUNSWICKAN**



EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Richard Hutchins

MANAGING EDITOR
Calum I. Johnston

NEWS EDITOR
Brenda Paul

ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR
M. Kaye MacPhee

SPORTS EDITOR
Ken Quigley

ASST. SPORTS EDITOR
Ernest Dunphy

OFFSET EDITOR
Tim MacKinnon

PHOTO EDITOR
Sandy Rabasse

ADVERTISING MANAGER
Kathi Davidson

AD DESIGN
Cindy Davis

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY
Wendy Douglas

TYPESETTING
Steve Boyko

SENIOR EDITORIAL ADVISORS
Michael MacKinnon
Timothy C. Lethbridge

Tom Henderson, Leith Chu, Barry Parkinson, Bill
Traer, Valerie White, Rick Gagneur, Todd Daley, John Stillwell,
Peter Thompson, Karen Mair, Paul
White, Ian Smith, Kelvin Fields, Dane Marshall, Colin Cadogan,
Gumby, Kate Johnson, Pam Johnson, Kelly Maher
Zoe Green, Kevin Grant, Melynda Jar-
ratt, Krista Campbell, Mark Oullette, Johnathan
Coghlan

The *Brunswickan*, in its 119th year, is Canada's oldest official student publication. The *Brunswickan* office is located in rm.35, Student Union Building, University of New Brunswick, P.O.Box 4400, Fredericton, N.B., E3B 5A3.

The *Brunswickan* is printed with flair at Covered Bridge Printing, Ltd., Hartland, N.B.

Subscriptions are \$20 per year. National and local advertising rates are available at (506)453-4974. General phone 453-4983. News line 453-4973.

The *Brunswickan* is copyright the *Brunswickan*. All rights reserved. The opinions expressed within are not necessarily those of the *Brunswickan's* editorial board, its staff, or its publishers (the UNB Student Union), or the administration of the university.

All letters to the editor must be typed and double spaced, and signed along with phone number. Names may be withheld by request. The *Brunswickan* reserves the right to refuse publication of letters with libellous, sexist, or racist material. Letters over 250 words may be edited for brevity.

Articles in the *Brunswickan* may be freely reprinted provided proper credit is given.

OPINION...

Airport security

by MELYNDA JARRATT

This summer we were all witness to the tragic effects of international terrorism when a flight originating out of Athens International Airport became the focus of a two-week hijacking and hostage-taking incident. When combined with the powerful draw of television, this flight showed us to what depths the media can sink in order to sell a story and it not only stirred up a lot of controversy as to the role of the media in times of crisis, but it also raised an awareness in all of us who travel by air as to the question of airport security. Certainly, caution and security were no laughing matter as literally thousands of American tourists cancelled their travel plans in Greece in response to a travel advisory given by the President of the United States which cited a definite lack of security at the Athens airport as the main culprit behind the hijacking. Speaking with American tourists in Europe this summer, I was shocked and dismayed by their unfortunate predicament...fear had replaced the usual flair with which they spend a two-week vacation in the playground of the Mediterranean. Despite the strength of the American dollar overseas and especially in Southern Europe, many chose to stay away from Athens rather than risk an unexpected side trip to some Middle Eastern country whose politics and language they don't understand

anyhow.

Sitting back here in the relative comfort of our Canadian shores, free for the moment anyway from the fear of hijackings, I can't help but wonder why we do not take lessons from incidents such as this. Although we may not consider ourselves to be in any real danger, the question of security precautions in Canadian airports is something that we should consider a bit more seriously. It is precisely this attitude which resulted in the familiar scenes of terror at European airports. In an age when the fate of literally thousands of airline passengers lies in the hands of an alert security crew, it is inconceivable that a person can literally strut past X-ray equipment and security guards without so much as a raised eyebrow...but that is exactly what I did last Saturday night on my way to Halifax via Eastern Provincial Airlines. Yessiree, I just strode right past all the precautionary equipment which is installed for the explicit purpose of being USED.

Laugh if you may, as you remind yourself, that, after all, this IS New Brunswick where the only major incidents have included an intoxicated man smashing through the glass windows of the Fredericton Airport entrance, and the only real media interest took place over a bag of marijuana. It seems that the security crew at the airport only takes a real interest in a passenger's safety when that

passenger happens to be the Queen of England. But laugh as you will, just as the normally sedate Norwegians did this past summer when on June 21 an equally as sedate fellow Norwegian hijacked a domestic flight to Oslo over a six-pack of beer, thus paving the way for Norway's first ever hijacking.

As a stewardess said to me upon my enquiry, "...at the little airports they think that it will never happen to them...it's always the other guy, the bigger airports that have to deal with the threat on a day to day basis..." And as the security guard at the Halifax International Airport said to me as my bags went through the X-Ray machine, "...we are supposed to check everybody who enters a plane...", but how can you when you have leaks in the system such as this, as she pointed towards a group of embarking passengers who were simply walking out of a side door towards the tarmac.

The most important lesson to be learned from hijackings and the like is that no airport is safe from a determined terrorist or even a drunk who just happens to have what looks like a gun. With that in mind, I ask you to think a little more about this question of airport security at the Fredericton Airport. Let us hope that a potential tragedy can be averted with the positive insight of a few administrative officials.

The damage is done

By BARRY PARKINSON
Brunswickan Staff

(Note: This article was written over the summer. That is it being published at this late date is a problem...but then, life is difficult, isn't it?)

Summer in Alberta continues apace. This week there were two rather newsworthy events: first, the beer strike is over, after more than 2 months. Personally, I didn't suffer too much, having access to a stash of Molson Malt. Still, it is nice to be back on sure footing. Second, the Keegstra hate-trial is officially over.

The guilty verdict and sentencing came through earlier today. (Actually, it was yesterday, this being a small-hours-of-the-morning column...new sleeping arrangements, and so forth.) While this will hardly be news in October, there are some aspects of the case which will be around for a long time.

One thing that is interesting is the general principal involved. While Zundel and Keegstra were charged under different laws, the freedom of expression idea plays heavily in both cases.

Now, maybe there is some kind of conspiracy going on. Maybe it's Zionist/world government; maybe it's Francophone/linguistic domination; maybe it's IBM/Yuppie drones. "In an infinite universe, anything is possible" (or something like that from the *Hitch-Hiker's Guide*.) I choose to reject at least the first two theories. Nevertheless, people should have the right to speak their minds.

In the Keegstra incident, though, the guy was preaching to his students - a captive audience with a certain amount of faith in Keegstra's credentials. A bad scene. Keegstra, I believe, was rightfully found guilty.

The Zundel case is more difficult. He simply spreads his ideas, disgusting and twisted as they may be. Can we afford to charge anyone with that?

Suppose I came out with a pamphlet which demands that all anti-semites be imprisoned. Is this Hate-"literature"? How does one hate "hate"? A weird paradox takes over at this point and we are forced, it seems, to either take a "free speech uber alles" approach or set up rigid guidelines about what is acceptable and what is not (this is the problem in the pornography debate as well.)

Ideally, Zundel should not have been hassled. But ideally, six million people should not have died. Denying genocide is criminal.

The law Keegstra was charged under deals with the

continued on page 10