

ET US OUT

WE'RE  
JUST  
DUMB  
YOU  
MEATHEAD

# sound-off

## Front Page Battle-Should we or Shouldn't we?

Editor's Note: There seems to be some confusion as to the purpose of last week's cover from various quarters.

It was not a personal attack on any particular candidate. It was a satirical comment on a style of campaign that was regarded as poor taste, if not blasphemous by many people as well as being rather removed from any political relevance.

### Against...

Dear Editor:

I find your January, 21st cover disgusting. This is a democratic country and anyone is entitled to run for office with their own views, and it is up to the voters to accept or reject their views according to their individual conscience. If The Brunswickan according to its Editor-in-Chief is "unbiased", I would hate to see actual bias. If The Brunswickan is going to shoot down one candidate, it should shoot down all three, if it is to be "unbiased", although three wrongs don't make a right, and such "satire" has no place on the cover.

Harry Brodie  
Peter Fullerton  
Ross Halcovitch  
Doug Steeves  
Judy Bunting

Dear Editor:

The last issue of the Brunswickan ran a cover which caused me to reread a campaign poster. Then I laughed... then I thought... then I detested. Now, I'm trying to understand. Why would anyone so maliciously attack and slander without any apparent just cause? It is sad that free speech and free press are used in this manner. It must be even sadder for the campaigner; I feel truly sorry this has happened to him.

I like the Brunswickan but it has committed a moral wrong... "Our paper, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." I hope the Brunswickan will correct this (accidental?) injustice.

Sincerely,  
Paul Sidney

Dear Editor:

I feel that your cover of January 21st is worthy of a few comments. To begin with I would like to quote part of your editorial entitled, Apathy here to stay, of November 12, 1976. "For the past two months, The Brunswickan has made some efforts to battle what we all know as 'apathy'. We here are sure that the readership has witnessed a lot of time and space in The Brunswickan devoted to the cause of killing this dreadful beast."

In the person of Steve Whalen we have an individual who has put time, effort, and most likely money into a campaign for the president of the SRC. Steve Whalen would seem then to be a student who is not apathetic. Why then has your newspaper so brutally slandered this individual? Frankly, I find your cover biased (obviously), an insult to the student body, and a mockery of journalism.

If you, as a newspaper, wanted to voice an opinion on Steve Whalen as political candidate for SRC president then there are much more objective methods available, i.e. Does he have previous experience with the SRC and has he been involved in other campus activities?

In closing, I hope that your cover of the January 21st issue is not indicative of the feelings of the majority of The Bruns staff members.

Sincerely,  
Colin Lockhart  
Harrison House

Dear Editor:

In regards to your past two issues, Jan. 14, and Jan. 21, 1977. My letter stems from a deep feeling of respect that I have always held for your paper in the past.

On Jan. 14 cover, I would like to answer the question posed to your readers, "What's missing in this photograph?" Simply, there is a general lack of talent shown in this kind of a newspaper cover. Are you trying to put out a good student rag, or just trying to impress your parents? Where does your respect for the student place in this picture? Your disregard for us is shown here quite well.

By the way, Pud says that Elke Sommer is missing from the photograph, but oh well.

Jan. 21 cover was really hitting at the balls of every student. Must you be so uncreative that you have to poke fun at someone?

Please clean up act -- or -- has it come to the point that you don't know what else to print. I really feel sorry for you people.

Yours,  
David Rogers

Dear Editor:

I am writing in regards to your front page of the past Bruns issue. This attack on Steve Whalen's campaign for the presidency was unnecessary and uncalled for. This shows a very narrow-minded, biased approach to the manner in which this candidate is running his campaign.

This front page material is strictly editorial and it should be noted that this is the Bruns' editorial comment on this candidate.

This Bruns issue, I find, is self-defeating. I find confusion on the intent of the paper.

Students in general are regarded by the Bruns as apathetic and not wanting to get involved and there is considerable effort on the Bruns in general to get more students involved. But now, when one student decides to try to make a contribution to the students he has found that he has been made the butt of very poor quality satire. Not very enticing to other students who may possibly want to get involved.

If the Bruns wasn't so critical of students and tried to be more cooperative you might find your results more rewarding. I am making this observation from my own experiences with the students here and I have been extensively involved.

This approach is necessary because few students are going to get involved when there is a large chance that they are going to be made the butt of a Bruns joke.

Thank you,  
Kevin Garland

### And For

Dear Editor:

I would just like to support The Bruns staff for the front page they printed in their Jan. 21 ish. It is almost certain that they are going to get a lot of flack from certain individuals that support that ridiculous form of presidential campaigning.

It has in the past been the practice of presidential candidates to list their credentials on their posters, so that students could see what each individual has behind him in the way of administrative experience. I think that it would be more appropriate for the individual involved to take his posters and run for Pope or some other similar position that requires divine designation.

So keep up the good work boys and girls you did a fine job, nuff said.

A CHSR Staffer

Dear Editor:

I would like to express my appreciation in your satire of a certain presidential campaign. I am not altogether in favour of a president who must show how good he can be by his ability to quote scripture. The old testament tells us that a true Christian when he prays should go into his room and lock the door, not stand on the street corner and scream his sins for all the world to hear. I'm not saying that being a Christian won't help the man in the office or do us, as students any harm, it might do some good; well what I'm trying to say is that it kind of scares me to think that a man must use the Lord, and I say use in its most vulgar sense, to gain in this world. Matthew, the same book he quoted from, in chapter five says,

"Blessed are the meek  
rmmm.....!"

Well, I don't intend to take my strength from a misuse of the Holy Bible, rather from the proper use!

One world though to The Bruns; although you did show the 8,000 persons who read your paper what kind of a person is running for president, you did almost overdo it. True that the posters of the candidate were in extreme bad taste and bordering on Blasphemy, your front cover, well it was just a few notches behind.

Finally, keep up the good work, but watch out for the thunderbolts out of the blue, if this person should be elected. Praise the Lord, don't use him.

Matthew Penny

Dear Editor:

We applaud your courage in printing the front cover of last week's issue of The Brunswickan. It is high time that the Fifth Estate had the intestinal fortitude to lampoon the pretentious self-styled leaders who continue to use trite phrases and quote scripture out of context for their own ends.

Yours omnipotently

A CHSR Staffer

### Challenge

Dear Editor:

A word, with your kind permission, to Mr. Z, Security Service, RCMP, Frederickton.

Mr. Gerry Laskey's excellent letter — The Brunswickan, Jan. 21, 1977 — forces me to challenge the leader of CPC(M-L) to debate his broken promise.

Sincerely,  
Maurice Spiro  
(Security Service Associate)

### Ladies and

Dear Ed. Werthmann:

At the risk of being considered reactionary, I take issue with your column of January 21, 1977. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary defines the word nigger as "1. A Negro (Colloq. and usu. contempt.)" and Funk & Wagnal's as "1. A Negro: a word once in good use, but now vulgar and opprobrious".

Your statement, "The word, people, is not meant to be derogatory towards any race," is invalidate by definition of the word nigger. The word does not have to be taken out of context to be considered "a malicious comment directed to any race, color or creed of people."

You then advised US to THINK about what was being said in the comic strip. I suggest that the author THINK about what he said, and then perhaps HE would realize

what he said.

Unfortunately for those of you involved in the art of communication, you have to go by public definitions of words and not your own, in order to communicate.

Anne Mullins

### ... gentlemen

Dear Editor:

I was much amused, two weeks ago, when you included the word "nigger" in your staff funnies. I was very anxious to see the negative feedback that I knew would show up in your "sound-off" page.

The feedback was exactly what I had imagined it to be. I had also thought up a good explanation for Ed to give in return.

I'm not saying that your answer was all that bad, Ed, but I think you missed Felix's problem: the writer was not attacking the concept — hell, he couldn't even understand the word!

No one needs to associate a black person with the word "nigger". To me a nigger is a slave; or a man doing someone else's work; or someone working for someone else's motives. I don't know about anyone else but that last bit about motives makes me think of students.

Anyways, the word nigger even when used in a derogatory manner doesn't seem to be a very strong remark.

I would worry more about the word "turkey". Now that sounds bad! I don't know what it means but I wouldn't want anyone to call me that name. Are you a turkey? I would rather be a student nigger than a turkey! What about you Felix?

Sincerely,  
Laurie Corbett CE 4

P.S. Pardon my lack of neatness but someone wants me to be an engineer and my studies didn't leave me much time.

### Tut-tut

Jim Dunphy  
Inter-residence Sports  
Committee Chairman

Dear Jim:

I am writing to bring to your attention, and the inter-residence sports committee, the conduct of the Victoria House basketball team on Sunday, January 16, 1977, during their game against Harrison House.

During the match, the Victoria House players committed twenty-nine personal and two technical fouls during the forty minute game. They showed no respect for the rules or the orderly progression of the contest. With

Continued on page 6