

BLOOD & THUNDER

Letters to the Editor

Defenders of Maggie Jean Don rebut criticism

Dear editor,

A misguided shot in the dark best describes the accuracy of the comments made by "name withheld by request" regarding Maggie Jean Chestnut Don, Moira McLaughlin in the February 21 issue of *The Brunswickan*.

For sixteen years Moira has given herself to Maggie Jean as a Don and friends of its residents. Maggie has always typically been a "haven" for mature students. Last week's letter clearly

Tell us, not the Bruns

As Co-president of Maggie Jean Chestnut Residence, I would like to inform the writer of last week's letter that the student newspaper is not the place to announce personal likes and dislikes. If you look at the house constitution, you will learn that president (or co-presidents) are to act as liaison between the Don and residents. If you have any concerns you wish to address, about the Don, house committee, or anything, please talk to the co-presidents. We do offer (REAL!) confidentiality, and have no opinions either way, about anybody.

Jody Sheldrick
Co-president of MJC

demonstrates little if any maturity with regards to the smear campaign initiated by this resident.

Compromise is an adult concept of discussing problems, attempting to gain mutual agreement. Name withheld, did you ever, on any occasion, attempt to discuss any of your concerns with Moira or would you just prefer to remain anonymous, throwing pot shots protected by your own immaturity?

If Moira is the awful Don that you claim, why do so many students and house residents seek her advice? Is this a coincidence? No! Cookies are not enough? Well consider this. Moira plays on the house volleyball team. This is just a blind guess, something you are all too familiar with, but are you on any house teams or involved in any house activities? Moira greets fresh on fresh week. Do you lend a hand?

Let's address your issue of the proctor. If this "first" proctor devoted as much time working with instead of against Moira, she would still likely be the proctor. A coin is always two-sided, and, unfortunately, yours is a one-dimensional view.

In regards to the house committee, did you ever consider that in assuming coincidences, perhaps it was actually the persons sitting on the committees and not Moira that was at fault? A resigning house committee member openly

states, to me, that he couldn't stand the pettiness of the house committee. That was his reason for quitting.

Being a Don is largely a thankless job. Being a building manager/record keeper/psychologist/surrogate mother/friend reflects in no way the pittance of compensation granted to Don. Your malicious and unfounded comments reaffirm the thankless nature of the job. You are a minority opinion and I imagine the merry band of twits supporting you have either a personal bone to pick or problems larger than any Don could handle.

What's this? A new perspective has been gained. Both sides of the story are now offered. Before deciding to "voice your concerns" perhaps your assumptions should have more support than your own petty gripes.

What then is my solution to your dilemma? Move the hell out of Maggie Jean, name withheld, experience life where no one is looking out for you, or there to counsel you on problems or perform the other multiple duties Moira performs on a daily basis. I assure you that outside the residence system, your pissing and moaning will rightly go unanswered.

Jeffrey Melanson
President of the Moira McLaughlin Fan Club

Student Protesters need some "hand"

Dear editor,

Last week, UNB students banded together to protest the imminent rise in tuition. Posters were pasted on walls stating that "even the cash cows had to say no," suggesting that we, the student body, should have some say in the matter. Those who organized the rally did so with the best possible intention, but you know the saying about good intentions. Students think that they can revisit the activism of the 1960s simply by organizing protests. Protests in themselves are almost completely impotent - it is the leverage of the protesters, their willingness to do something that is the real power.

I am certainly not suggesting that the protests of the 60s were all that myth has made them, but at least they had some power, or they thought they did, which can be just as exhilarating. Protesters of the 60s had what has been described on Seinfeld as "hand." The UNB protesters had zero hand. Hand is simply the threat of action. That action need not be prescribed in any way. It can be as seemingly harmless as a sit-in. The sit-in was commanding for one simple reason - university or government administrators dreaded twenty long-haired, joint smokers in their office. It was as simple as that. The threat was simply that they wouldn't leave, like some annoying, drunk guest, who won't leave at 3am in the morning. UNB students are unwilling to take such steps, to be that annoying.

There are, of course, other means of actively

showing contempt for university policy. Students could form a human barrier around campus parking lots. Students could form picket lines around the SUB or Tilley Hall. The most powerful kind of protests, however, are those that show student power, but are also symbolic of the protest issue. The best example of this would be to withhold fees en masse in September. Everyone would register normally, but refuse to pay when the time comes. If you want to see a university scramble, all you have to do is dip into their pocket - just for a moment - to let them

know that you are serious.

Is this a call to arms? Perhaps, but I am not advocating physical violence. There are a wide range of avenues open to students, more than we have imagined in two decades. For too long, we have let others decide our fate. Political scientists would describe this as quietism. I suggest that we should voice our opinions in a way that will force the administration to listen. We must regain some hand.

hart caplan

Remembering Eric Garland

Dear Ms. Rogal-Black,

It was saddening news when I learned of Eric Garland's death over the weekend. Although I did not know him for a very long time, Eric had a profound impact on my life. He once spoke to one of my classes where he offered to make himself available at any time to talk to students about engineering. I took him up on his offer...a decision I have never regretted as Eric mentored to me and inspired me to new heights. And, he did so by teaching the value and responsibility of being an engineer.

Engineering is not simply technical skill or knowledge gained in a classroom. It is also much more than a career. Eric spoke with conviction when he taught that engineering was a way of life. He instilled the belief that

engineering is about concern for the well being of others. He taught that engineers are stewards of and for, the people, stewards of technology, and stewards of the environment. But, most of all, Eric taught that engineering is about people. He taught that one cannot be separated from the other and that engineering cannot be practised without concern for the well being of all life.

Eric was a kind and wonderful man. His concern was always for what he could do for others. He was someone that all engineers could admire and aspire to imitate. Eric C. Garland was an engineer in the truest sense of the word. He will be dearly missed.

Sincerely,
Andrew Gorlick

Football program shouldn't be on backs of students

To the editor:

I realize that this letter will not be published until after the referendum has taken place, but as I have some strong concerns about the proposal I feel compelled to express them.

In this time of economic restraint, especially for students, I do not feel as though it is fair to ask students to pay any more than they absolutely have to. Granted it is only an extra \$10 a year they are asking for, I do not see the justice in asking 7000 students to put forth money that will allow only 70 or so students to participate in a new sport. The ten dollars per student does not seem like much, but when all added up it will account

for 47% of a \$150,000 per year operating budget.

I do not completely object to football at UNB, although I do oppose to the students contributing to the funding. I propose that UNB take the same route as the University of Toronto did with their football program. At U of T, the University gave the approval for a football program but the alumni had to raise all of the necessary funding. At U of T, the Athletics Department allocates 50% of its budget to female sports and 50% to male sports. Since football at the university level is an all male sport, they would have to match that funding for a female sport. Since this posed a great financial burden, it was up to

the alumni to find the funding. If the "Friends of UNB Football" want this program badly enough, they will find a way to make it happen without any financial assistance from the students.

I also question the reality of being able to raise \$6,000.00 to \$10,000.00 by conducting a summer football camp as proposed in their budget. Currently, UNB nets only \$9,000.00 for all of its athletic camps at a cost of \$167,000.00. The likelihood of one football camp being able to raise these funds is highly questionable in my mind. If these funds are not raised, is it possible that they may hit on students for more money?

I must agree with Kelly Lamrock's comments which appeared in the February 21st of *The Brunswickan*. He identified the real issue as being "Why is there money out there for football when it is not out there for something else? If we are going to go out there now and raise an additional \$2,000,000.00 or so for football, what does that mean about library acquisitions, campus lighting, hiring professors, creating new academic programs, upgrading new facilities on campus or improving the quality of residence life?" Each of these ideas will benefit a much greater proportion of the student body than will football.

I believe that this is a very poor time to be asking students to fork out additional money especially with the possibility of tuition increases looming on the horizon. To be put simply, those who really want football should be the ones paying for it.

Sincerely,
Troy W. Lifford

Snowball fights are a right!

To the Editor:

Every Canadian has had the same childhood experience of a snowball fight.

A snowball fight is Canadian to the bone and always will be. I don't understand why when we're all 18 to 20 yrs. Old that the guys in all the residences can't just go out there and have fun and have a decent snowball fight... without interruptions.

The administration is too anal. What is so bad about it? Most of the guys are Canadian and all we want is a stress reliever. Not all of us are getting laid every night, not all of us have the cash to get loaded every night. I don't understand the logic in what Craighead and his sidekick are doing when they come out to stop us. This is university, the best years of our

lives. I feel like I'm in a situation where no fun is to be had. Snowball fights are fun, a broken window etc...I don't give a rat's ass. Fine then, charge me the 17 cents to contribute to the cost of the replacement, it's worth it! It's a lot better than being a wimp and retreating every time Craighead and what's his name come out. There are at least a hundred of us sometimes, what the hell are they going to do?

To have fun is a right, and when you hit that guy on the other side in a good spot so you see the snow going everywhere on impact, that's fun, as demented as it is to those who oppose, it's fun. We want fun! Fuck the rules!

Name withheld by request

Womynsay

*Some men say: Get on with it or get over it.
Lenin says: To debate for debate's sake is a waste of time.
Chomsky would say: Things worth saying cannot be discussed in 10 lines or 5 minutes.*

But again, I digress by focusing on what white men say. To be frank, the point of the womynsay column is to provide a forum for women's voice's-which is a primary form of action and expression. To speak does not necessarily mean to be heard-which is my point. When men speak, we hear what they say because they are the fathers, the premiers, the bankers- the authority figures in society.

They are the ones who control social relations, being the propertied class, and are granted power through patriarchy. How many times has a young woman been told: This is a man's world!? Does not a father "give his daughter away" at her wedding? Once again, reiterating the property relationship between men and women. Yet we, as womyn, cannot exclude ourselves from this world, nor do we necessarily want to. We live in the same world and share the same living space and oxygen as men. Yes we often retreat behind walls to isolate ourselves from the opposite sex, to enjoy times of validation and fulfillment as women, not as wives, secretaries or mothers. I believe men do the same. But we are apart of this world- and must recognize that our battle lies within it- not outside of it.

This does not mean that I advocate fighting

the patriarchal structures which will continue to oppress women-but to educate men and find those men, indeed those PEOPLE willing to listen to women and join them in their fight to transform society into one which does not emphasize the oppression of gender, race, religion or sexual preference.

My point of writing my article regarding the Royal Commission experience was to share the realities of my patriarchal experience with other people in hopes to enlighten them on the reality of the Commission and its exclusion of women and Aboriginal peoples. This is the way most functions in society operate. Women do not disregard things that men say- we just want them to pay us the same respect. And by not hearing our voices at the conference, the institutions of patriarchy were, once again, reinforced.

To say: Get on with it or get over it can be loosely translated into "Put up or shut up." As womyn with voices, we refuse to put up with patriarchy, or those who are intent on perpetuating its oppression on us, nor do we intend to let our voices continue to fall on deaf ears.

No longer will we put up- and we will definitely no longer shut up.

End women's silence- and let our voices be heard!

This is what womyn say.

Gabrielle Slowey



With All My Mind?

"Love your neighbour as yourself." That was the great commandment of Jesus. There is a "Golden Rule" version: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Both have validity and importance for public life. In fact, some would argue that our current failure to heed them has led us into considerable social turmoil.

Actually, Jesus issued another great commandment: "Love God with all your soul, heart, and mind." We often privatize this one because it is considered more "religious" - it incorporates "God language." By privatizing this commandment we come to think public life isn't much affected whether or not we love God. But is this really so?

The devotion of heart and soul to God has a private, personal dimension, no doubt. Yet its expression is also public, and even more so when it comes to loving God with all one's mind. But what does it mean to love God with all one's mind?

University education develops the mind. Through study, research, reading and writing one's horizons are broadened. One is exposed to the thoughts and ideas of others. By wrestling with these we potentially become increasingly imaginative and creative.

As valuable as I regard education, I am always left with the question "for what?" Why am I educating myself? Whom am I serving? What, and for whom, is the payoff?

In a recent article entitled "Who should pay for university education?" (Canadian Public Policy), it was stated that in spite of pending tuition increases, university education "is still a good deal and a healthy return on investment." Using current market analyses, the authors maintain that university education is worthwhile because it is still cost-effective - there is a positive rate of return. University education is worth the cost because of what it gains for us: better jobs, higher salaries.

The article reflects a prevailing attitude: education for the sake of a good investment return. Education becomes a commodity; it becomes commercialized.

Should we be surprised that many are beginning to feel that if university education is little more than a business venture - a monetary investment into one's own personal future - then students should bear the burden of the cost of this investment? After all, any business venture requires an initial outlay of capital. But wait a minute. Is education simply a business venture?

Every Sunday morning I give assent to the

command to love God. I am to love God with all my soul and heart. But in the same breathe I also include "with all my mind." With my university educated mind, I am also called to love God.

My university education, therefore, is much more than a business venture. The "positive rate of return" is not measured exclusively in dollars, or status, or power, or influence. The command to love God with all my mind is then seemingly at odds with the general trend in the university, the business community, and public policy which tells me to devote my mind to seeking an investment return understood largely, if not exclusively, in market language.

Can one love God and Mammon (money, investment return, material wealth)? Is it really possible? Somehow I doubt it. Something tells me that this approach is really self-serving. It seeks to give me advantage.

The university, in days past, was devoted to seeking "the truth." This was understood to mean understanding God, the universe and humankind, so one could be of service to others. Today the university seems to be devoted to seeking "a healthy return on investment." That's business language. In fact, UNB President Parr-Johnston stated some months ago that "only with partnership with the business community can we remain relevant."

So the choice is, seemingly, one or the other. Using our minds to pursue material wealth, or using it to love God and neighbour. Loving God and neighbour with all our minds entails "seeking the Kingdom of God", which Jesus says should be our first priority.

Seeking the "Kingdom of God" is using our educated minds to recognize the sovereignty of God, and to make our world - our nation, our environment, our neighbourhood, our society - a better place to live for everyone. It is to strive for equity and justice for all humans, not a privileged few. Interestingly enough, one can hardly imagine that there can be any lack of work here, any unemployment. It is a shame that educated minds are unemployed.

This kind of approach is not self-serving. It does not seek to give me exclusive advantage. The Hebrew prophet Micah captured its essence: "do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly before God" (Micah 6:8). Loving God with all my soul, heart and mind, is to reflect God the Creator. That is the purpose of living. That is the purpose of being educated. That also ties in well with the commandment to love our neighbour. In fact, the two are really one.

the brunswickan
Canada's Oldest Official Student Publication
Established 1867

Editor-in-Chief (Acting) Joseph W.J. FitzPatrick III	Features Editor Jenn Brown	Typesetter Maria Paisley	Staff Jethelo E. Cabilete, Jon Bartlett, Christina Atkinson, Elizabeth Demerson, Damian Penny, Jonathan Clinch, Mark McCready and Aaron MacEachern.
Managing Editor Joseph W.J. FitzPatrick III	Distractions Editor Trina Kilpatrick	Business Manager Charlene Keddy	Contributors Gordon Loane, Jessica Audley, Andrew Sheppard, Lisa Clark, and Glenn Murphy.
News Editor A. VOY DYTE	Online Editor Cynthia Kirkby	Advertising Manager Bill Traer	Viewpoint Banner Illustrated by Kent Wiczell
Entertainment Editor Peter J. Cullen	Campus Editor Dennis German	Proofreader Jen Trites	This issue is dedicated to: My two missing Marys - Mary Rogal-Black and Mary Splane, My Wild Irish Rose. I couldn't have do it without you.
Interim Sports Editor Maria Paisley	Book Editor Elise Craft	Science Editor Amy McComb	
Photo Editor Jud DeLong			

The Brunswickan, in its 130th year of publication, is Canada's oldest official student publication. We publish weekly during the school year, with a circulation of 10,000 copies. *The Bruns Online* is an ongoing e-zine version of *The Brunswickan*, located at the World Wide Web at <http://www.unb.ca/web/bruns>. The opinions contained in this newspaper are those of the individual writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of *The Brunswickan*.

All members of the university community are encouraged to contribute to *The Brunswickan*. While we endeavour to be an open forum for a variety of viewpoints and ideas, we may refuse any submission considered racist, sexist, libellous, or those containing attacks of a strictly personal nature. *The Brunswickan* reserves the right to edit for brevity and clarity. Letters generally shouldn't exceed 300 words in length and must contain your signature, student number and phone number, or they will not be printed.

All copy submitted must be double spaced, on one side of the page only and must be legible. If we can't read it, we won't print it. You think that sounds obvious, but if you could see the horrors we've seen... *The Brunswickan* accepts copy on 3.5 inch disk, either Macintosh or MS-DOS format. Articles printed in *The Brunswickan* may be freely reprinted provided proper credit is given. 'Cause the last thing we want to be accused of is greediness.

The Brunswickan is proudly printed by New Brunswick Publishing Inc. of Saint John. This week's paper was delivered by Jud DeLong and Jen Trites, they rented a truck this week, "Crew Cut Jack" was sick. Of course, none of this would have been possible if James hadn't been there to tag us on. Thanks.
Subscription rates are \$27 per year. Second class mail is in effect #8120. Contact the Sales Manager for further details. National advertising rates are available from Campus Plus at (416) 362-6468.

The Brunswickan
Student Union Building
University of New Brunswick Fax: (506) 453-4958
P.O. Box 4400
E3B 5A3 CANADA

Phone: (506) 453-4983
Advertising: (506) 453-5073
E-Mail: bruns@unb.ca
WWW Site: <http://www.unb.ca/web/bruns>