

Blood and Thunder

"Looney Feminist Viewpoint"?

With all of the media attention given to women and the corresponding need to make a genuine break with derogatory slurs aimed at a person's gender, it is absolutely appalling that the Brunswickan's editors, and in particular, viewpoint interviewer Karen Kelly, would serve up such a ridiculous and contemptible question as "What (the hell) is the problem with men." That they did is in itself bad enough, but compounding their extraordinary tastelessness were the absurdly banal generalizations offered as answers by a number of so-called educated young women presently enrolled at UNB.

For instance, one 'erudite' respondent, Ms. Rideout, said of men: "They're too obnoxious". Another particularly brilliant response was given by Ms. Gallagher, who said: "They're all jerks and creeps..." These two women have, of course, perfectly refined "people skill", and have never solicited negative responses from some people they have met because of their own attitudes and actions. Fortunately there were a couple of women who gave responses which showed remarkable thoughtfulness as well as exceptional sensitivity. One in particular, voiced by Ms. Trevors, pointed out a concern which is all too prevalent in many relationships today. For her, the men she knows are never around when a shoulder is needed to lean on, or an ear to listen, and give implicit support by demonstrating that someone cares. Hopefully, Ms. Trevors, you will find new friends, both male and female, who can measure up. The other positive comment which deserves mention was offered by Ms. Graham. More than her mere words, Ms. Graham demonstrated the value of a positive frame of mind. Her ability to treat others with respect, showing tolerance and understanding has been rewarded. An aura of contentment and enthusiasm, which is obvious to those fortunate enough to know this remarkable woman, emanates continuously. Lastly, there is Ms. Harriman. She offered five hours of her time to criticise men as an aggregate. May I be

so bold as to suggest to Ms. Harriman, if you have such time to spare, it might be put to better use if you tried to work out your own obvious attitude and personality problems.

Undoubtedly, it will be suggested by some that Ms. Kelly's viewpoint was meant as a joke, for a laugh or two. Would these people feel the same way if a similar question was run about women? Ms. Kelly and her collaborators just might consider such a follow up question as the right or fair thing to do, for equality's sake, etc. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is truly a pity that 'The Brunswickan' has demonstrated such a slanted editorial bias without recognising their explicit support for a double standard.

Ms. Kelly's viewpoint was simple minded and frivolous. There is no place in a newspaper, especially a university newspaper which is supposed to be a forum for enlightened ideas, for such unsophisticated tripe. I must say though, Ms. Kelly has been of enormous assistance to me and my efforts to get something published in The British satirical bi-weekly *Private Eye*. Indeed, it is with great confidence that I can send off her article knowing I have just won my first five quid for submitting a spectacular gem to *Private Eye*'s column on loony feminist nonsense.

David Hall

Editor's Note: On Friday, September 26, 1986 a regularly scheduled general meeting of the Brunswickan staff was held. At this meeting a motion was put forth that the Viewpoint question for Friday, October 3, 1986 be "What (the hell) is the problem with men?" on the condition that it be followed on Friday, October 10, 1986 by the question "What (the hell) is the problem with women?" The motion was carried by a majority vote.

One Side of the Story

Dear Editor:

Your coverage of the student government dispute in recent issues has contained various incorrect statements. In particular:

1. Ken Quigley (September 12th) reported that "Michael Bennett has brought legal action against the present interim executive". Valerie White (September 19th) wrote that the "VP Academic of the 'old' Student Union is suing every member of the 'new' Student Union Incorporated and its Vice Presidents Michael Bennett, Anthony English, and Hugh Brown. The Brunswickan has refused to print the fact that the UNB Student Union Inc. is a corporate plaintiff in the case.

2. Various news stories refer to the Vice President (Academic) Michael Bennett, Vice President (Finance) Anthony English, Vice President (Services) Hugh Brown and others as the "former" or "deposed" executive officers of the UNB Student Union. In reality, the court notice names us as the current elected executives of the Union who are still holding these positions. The attempts to depose the executive were illegal and it is improper for *The Brunswickan* to take sides in the dispute by continually referring to us as if we had truly been removed from our elected positions.

3. Other articles refer to the Semple group as "the Student Council". While the Semple group has been claiming to be the Student Council since they staged their palace coup on April 17th, they have no legal basis for their claim. Many members of Council were not even informed of the move to try to depose the elected executive. Those persons who did participate did not constitute a proper quorum, gave no proper notice of a meeting, did not comply with the conditions for the proper removal from office of executives, and included among their number persons who were not even members of Council themselves. In short, they violated the corporate bylaws of the Student Union. The so-called meeting in which Downey's agents claim to have deposed the elected executive was in no way a legally constituted meeting of the Student Union Council and as a result, we are calling upon the court to declare null and void all actions taken by the Semple group in the name of the Student Union since April 17th, 1986.

4. Commenting on the Semple group's decision to stage an

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Rm. 35, Student Union Building, UNB Campus
DEADLINE: 5 p.m. Tuesday

"election" for October 22nd, Valerie White (September 26th) said "an election is the best thing that could happen to the Student Union. At least the debate over who runs it will be ended, and legally at that." Ms. White is mistaken. The court action must continue because the Semple group has no legal right to call or conduct elections. The executive, and supporters of the elected Student Union government will not participate in, or recognize the result of any mock elections called by the Semple group. Their actions of April 17th, alleging to "dismiss" the elected officers of the UNB Student Union Inc., and their violations of the Union's corporate bylaws clearly demonstrate that they do not respect the electoral choices of the student body. Any "election" conducted by such a group would, by definition, be unfair and illegitimate. The "palace coup" demonstrated the Semple group's contempt for student democracy and proved that their planned elections are little more than a feeble attempt to legitimize their tainted past.

5. Barry Parkinson (October 3rd) implies that we are melodramatic by referring to the Semple group's illegal takeover of April 17th as a "palace coup". We respond with the fact that that terminology was introduced last spring by the Semple group's own lawyer, Peter Forbes, who admitted in writing that his clients' actions constituted a "palace revolt". Since that time, the Semple group has expediently chosen to be defended in court by an amazon from their new law firm of Hanson, Hachey. The choice of this firm did not surprise us since Mr. Hachey, as a member of the UNB Board of Governors, voted to ratify Dr. Downey's participation in the palace coup at the May 21st Board meeting. It should be of some interest to your readers to learn that our legal costs are being paid out of our own pockets, while the Semple group's personal legal costs are being paid with students' money from the student fees collected by the University at registration.

6. Mr. Parkinson (October 3rd) goes on to question my sense of reality because I said that "Canada is founded on principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of Law, not the supremacy of

Downey and the rule of his student contras". The first clause of that sentence is a quotation from the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms--a very real document. The second clause bears witness to the fact that the Semple group clearly violated the Union's bylaws only because they knew they had the support of Dr. Downey to order the SUB Director and security guards to lock out and remove the executive from their offices. In essence, the Semple group called an external authority (the UNB Administration) to takeover the Student Union. Consequently, we are forced to call upon a more powerful external authority (the Court of Queen's Bench) to restore the Student Union government.

We are pursuing this case to the very end because we believe in justice and democracy. We have invested a great deal of time in the Student Union, and much of our personal funds in this legal battle, because we believe that the student movement is something well worth fighting for.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Bennett
Vice President (Academic)

Editor's Note: The opinions and/or accusations presented in this letter are in no way representative of the Brunswickan, its editorial board, staff, or publishers.

The Saga Continues...

Dear Editor:

I am replying to a letter in the September 26th issue of the Brunswickan.

As many of your readers are probably aware, I am a plaintiff in the lawsuits launched against a group of individuals who claim to represent the University of New Brunswick Student Union Incorporated. On the night of April 17th, 1986. These individuals, with the assistance of various representatives of Dr. James Downey and security guards, locked out the UNB Student Union executives from their offices in the Student Union Building. We were given fifteen minutes to remove our

Continued on page 18