

Blood and Thunder

Orientation Speaks

Dear Editor:

In response to a letter appearing in last week's issue of the Brunswickan (from a parent of a freshmen concerning the use of alcohol on campus, I would like to clarify a few points.

U.N.B. Orientation '89 did not ever provide or in the least way promote or make accessible any alcohol beverage of any kind. The "events" that the parent has been told that took place during (not a part of) Orientation Week were not in any way affiliated with U.N.B. Orientation. We have not been sponsored by a brewery in 5 years and all of our freshmen events were alcohol-free. The apparent confusion that the parent seems to have is completely separate from our program.

It's true. During Orientation Week alcohol is consumed, often in unhealthy doses. We do not endeavor to deny it - rather, we try to deal with it. U.N.B. Orientation has taken a proactive role in making the freshmen realize that they have an alternative to drinking, through our involvement with the S.M.A.R.T.-P.A.C.C. alcohol awareness program.

We cannot possibly, nor is it our capacity to supervise freshmen day and night. University is about mature decision-making. It is our responsibility to help them realize the importance of a healthy life-style, not to dictate their actions.

Actions do speak louder than words, and we feel that U.N.B. Orientation speaks for itself.

John Marshall
Chairman, UNB Orientation '89

Get A Life

Dear Editor

Last Friday morning, I went to the Harriet Irving Library for some last minute cramming before a 10:30 midterm. I settled in one of the study booths by the bookcases on the first floor. I had just become immersed in William the Conqueror's reforms when I heard a steady "Scratch! Scratch! Scratch!" coming from the booth directly behind me. Recognizing the sound as pencil on metal, I realized some nimrod was scratching "I Love Bill" or something on the metal desk partition, and was confident the now irritating noise would stop soon.

It didn't. Five minutes later, I coughed, hoping the person would understand he/she was disturbing me (and now the guy in the desk in front of me's) peace. The scraper stopped, so I began studying once again. A few minutes later, the noise began again, this time louder than ever! Not wanting to waste any precious cramming time or commit assault, I decided to move to a quieter desk. On my way out, I annoyedly looked at the person who I was sure was

writing her life story on the desk partition. She didn't look up.

Later that day, I went back to the library and letting my curiosity get the best of me, sat in the booth where the graffiti girl had sat that morning. Imagine my surprise to see a huge, 3 feet high, carefully drawn penis on the metal partition! So much for "I Love Bill".

So, to the permed blonde in purple: GET A LIFE! This is not George St. Jr. High. This is university. I would appreciate it if you would wet your sexual frustrations and/or fantasies in some other way. Aren't there hotlines for people like you? Oh, but that would entail dialling a phone and I'm sure your IQ isn't high enough to cope with that. You're the same sort who refuse to flush public toilets. Next time, do us all a favour and draw your pictures on paper! Then you can take your works of "art" home. That way they will get the appreciation they deserve.

PS It wasn't even a good likeness.

(what the hell, I'll sign my name)
S. London.

Absurd to Compare

Dear Editor:

After following the subject in recent issues of the Brunswickan, I have a few words on the subject of smokers plying their habit in non-smoking areas. As an ex-smoker who kicked the habit fourteen years ago, I can understand the attitude held by many smokers, that they have a "right" to smoke while socializing in public places. One correspondent associated this with "higher laws of human rights privileges that exist in democratic countries". But this is a delusion - is it a higher ideal to become addicted to fumes that are a proven health hazard to not only the users, but to people who happen to share close proximity? This is a case of expecting a "right" to inflict damage not only on one's self, but on anyone nearby.

Twice I've seen the argument that smokers are forced to breathe the exhaust fumes of other people's cars, so others should not complain about their tobacco fumes. Don't these smokers ever get in cars? Automobiles are a serious pollution problem in need of a solution, yet transportation of commodities and people are indispensable. It's absurd to compare a problem of this magnitude with the social problem of an expensive and unhealthy addiction which has absolutely no benefit to anyone.

I have frequently had to change seats in the SUB cafeteria during weekdays recently, to get away from nearby smokers fumes. I wasn't forcing any comparable unpleasant circumstance on them. They were sitting right under prominent "No Smoking" signs, and displayed a flagrant disregard for anyone but themselves. If they can't quit, they should at

least refrain from forcing the unpleasant effects on others around them. Perhaps a compromise would be to have a separate smoking room near the cafeteria.

Bryce McInnis

Not As Bad

Dear Editor

I never miss an opportunity to open my mind to the opinions of others, I wish they could do the same for me.

Heather "I read what I want" Humber says I state "... a total of 3 people smoking ...". Wrong, I said no such thing (see my letter Oct 20, Bruns). Heather Humber says in her Oct 27 letter (which I read), "We, as smokers, respect ... and abide by (the new law) ...". Who exactly is smoking in the cafeteria - non-smokers? Aliens? Please read my letter, Heather Humber, it is not directed to you.

Yesterday, two people immediately beside me decided to light up. I took my own advice and reminded them that smoking is prohibited in the cafeteria. One said "What about him?" and the other used his cigarette to improve the flavor of his Beaver Brew. They will probably continue.

Regarding this "Smoking is OK 'cause it's not as bad as exhaust fumes from cars" argument" I feel certain my vehicle harms the health of Heather Humber and Lisa Gregoire less than their smoke does me. They are already killing themselves with cigarettes and I only drive after sex, or a fine meal. I abide by the "No motorcycles in the SUB Cafeteria" rule, and I agree with it. It is hard to quit biking.

People still smoke in the cafeteria. I am not sure if they are actually smokers. They may be aliens.

Anyone got a light?

Ken Knight
Still in the SUB Cafeteria

Deal With The Issue Yourself

Last week, most smokers were misrepresented by Heather Humber's petrifying article in response to Ken Knight's article of 20th October 1989, concerning the SUB cafeteria non-smoking law. This is why:

1. You claim that "the lack of enforcement is a problem that the SUB Staff should deal with and is not the fault of smokers." How PITIFUL. Does not the lack of enforcement of a certain law mean that certain acts of crime are not being enforced against adequately? Hence, if those acts of crime did not occur, then there would not have been a lack of enforcement or even the need of a law in the first place ... right? Who then are we to blame for CREATING this lack of

enforcement? The criminal or the enforcer? The criminal! Of course, in this case, the SMOKERS!! So, Heather don't piss on the wall and blame the janitor. Blame the smokers not the SUB Staff.

2. You claim that pollution is not only caused by smokers but also by other things such as cars ... that is correct. You then ask Ken whether he owns a car., YES! He too would be polluting the environment, but surely he wouldn't drive it in the SUB Cafeteria! Absurd, isn't it? We of course drive cars in designated areas, such as roads and driveways. Just as there are designated areas for smokers to light up - not in the SUB Cafeteria.

So lighten up Heather.

Richard Makone

Last Resort

Regarding the smokers right (It's Mutual - Lisa Gregoire) the arguments used are misleading and some of them amusing.

It is true that most of us drive cars and contribute to the pollution. We also pollute the environment by running our factories which made food that we eat and clothes that we all wear. But this does not make it right to smoke in a public area. We are all so overcome by all sorts of pollution around us that for a few hours that we sit in a closed environment, we desire to breath fresh air (at least we like to think so) and relax. Unfortunately most smokers use the weak argument that since the outside air is foul and polluted, it is okay to make the air inside polluted as well. Pollution of the environment is a big issue and each one of us should try our best to solve it, not add to it.

I believe that every one is entitled to their rights but be reasonable for a minute and put yourselves in our situation. What would you do if a group of students start to exercise their "right" by performing a traditional custom of burning herbs and incense in the SUB Cafeteria? What if exposure to the fumes causes some sort of health disorder such as hair-loss or loss of appetite of whatever. Would you accept the consequences my dear smoker even if it is proven that prolonged exposure to car exhaust would also result in the same symptoms?

Smoking in a public area is wrong since it affects all of us and it will take from us our last resort for a few minutes of fresh air.

Ramin Rohani

Porn Perusers Picked On

Dear Editor:

I am writing in regards to last weeks opinion column concerning pornographic material on sale at the SUB store. Give

me a break! I understand that this is an OPINION COLUMN and do not object to Mike Matheson's right to voice his opinion; but, I find several problems inherent in it.

For one, he is confusing various issues here; he questions the appeal of pornographic material, the moral issues involved in the sale of it - but most importantly, he arbitrarily states that there exists some sort of link between sexual preferences and intelligence! Personally, I don't care who this material appeals to. Secondly, the morality of pornography is a complex issue that involves degradation on one side and censorship on the other. I am more concerned with the last point: that of education vs. sex.

If Mike had done his homework, he would have come across many important political, scientific and literary figures of history that have engaged in questionable sexual activities. In no way was their knowledge diminished by their private affairs. It comes down to whether or not one believes that people's private activities should be censored. What a ridiculous notion! Yet, even more ridiculous is his opinion that pornographic magazines in some way inhibit knowledge of higher education and that the availability of such material on campus reflects the academic teaching at UNB.

If I learned anything at my four years at UNB, it is that only through liberal minded thinking and acceptance of all ideas that one can begin to learn. Censorship is not the answer, suppression of thought is no solution. This is not to say that any knowledge can be gained from pornography, only that it is irrelevant and unimportant where education is concerned. If Mr. Matheson has a moral gripe against pornography, let him then argue its morality. I prefer that he would not use the lame excuse of its inhibiting knowledge as the theme behind his debate.

A university is an arena for the discussion of morality; it should not be partisan to one side or the other.

Lisa Gregoire
BA IV

P.S. Hats off to Steve Griffiths' article "schadenfraude" intelligent article, insightful, sarcastic and point well taken.

Bruns Beef Balderdash

Dear Editor

I was informed by the person who answered the phone at the Brunswickan on Wednesday, October 25th, the the Bruns is (and I quote, PROPERLY) "dying for stories that have to do something with things on

Continued on page 19