MUGWUMP

by Allan Carter

I wonder if there ever has been, in the history of the Student Union, one time when they let the Brunswickan have their full honoraria without an argument? Somehow I doubt it. For those who don't know, we here at the Bruns receive a token of appreciation for the work we do which is known as an honoraria. The Student Union members also get one and so do a few other organizations which are funded by the Student Union. This year it looked like we were not going to get our full amount at the Brunswickan because Governor Steve Williams felt we did not do a good enough job. At the Student Union meeting on Wednesday night he had some reservations about giving us our full honoraria because we placed a full length editorial on the front page of the Brunswickan when the Union decided not to upgrade our computers, but stated they would give us a new printer which, in effect, would make the printer almost totally useless without the memory upgrading. Since we were having difficulty getting this through the skulls of the Student Union we decided to run a newspaper with only ads. However, after a discussion with the VP Finance and the President of the Student Union who assured us that they would do all they could to rectify the situation, we decided to run a newspaper but with a front page editorial.

Well, Williams is still disgruntled about all this and Wednesday night he put forward a few points to as why we shouldn't receive our full honoraria. He felt that the Brunswickan should be serving the students and not themselves. Perhaps we are not serving the students, although no one from the Union expressed this sentiment to anybody here at the Bruns during this term. The fact that we are serving ourselves is so obvious I am shocked no one brought it up but Steve Williams. After all we never cover any events on campus or in the community. Every week we run pictures of the staff and only write articles and editorials about ourselves (especially that damn Mugwump!). And our delivery is really bad. We send every copy of this newspaper, which totals about 10, 000, to only our closest friends and our own homes. When we are finished putting out the newspaper we disconnect the computers and take them home with us for the weekend and sometimes we even take a desk or two so we have something to put the computers on.

Then Williams made his next strong point. Our issue with the front page editorial is not a real newspaper. Now I have problems with this one. From what I can recall the newspaper was made of paper and also ink. It even had pictures in it and had a sports section, a news section, classifieds, Upcoming, etc. etc.. And from what I hear every cat in Fredericton agreed it was newspaper when the issue was place in their kitty box litter. Furthermore, the recycling company even accepted copies of this newspaper. I think Williams is alone on this point, but not to worry his last statement is brilliant.

We are an anti-student publication. Damn, how did he find out? We told everybody down here to stay quiet about that. The secret is out and now everybody knows we are an anti-student publication. What a scandal! I wonder when the TV cameras and the reporters will start pouring into our offices. Every advertiser will boycott us now and before long the esteemed well paid staff at the Brunswickan wil be sitting on a bench in the cold winter night trying to warm themselves with anti-student newspapers saying "That Williams, he is a smart fox, no one else could see through our disguise."

Anyhow, the vote was close. Apparently, like myself, some councillors felt Williams made some excellent arguments and wanted to pursue the matter further. Unfortunately, the councillors who this anti-student publication threatened and bribed, pushed the full honoraria through and now students across the UNB campus will have an unrestful holiday knowing that the anti-student publication will still be at UNB when they return!

It has arrived - white, cold, wet, slippery and ugly snow has arrived. Everyone was so concerned that we wouldn't have any snow for Christmas. Well, stop your worrying, you got what you deserved, along with everybody else who was content with looking at dead grass and lifeless trees. Now the white stuff has covered everything and it's so damn cold it won't melt, not this time.

The skiers can get out their skis, the children can get out their slides and the fools can get out their snowmobiles. What will the rest of us do who are not convinced that there is something positive about having snow for Christmas (and probably until April), we'll stay in our houses during the holiday season drinking eggnog trying to decide whether or not we should shovel off the mound of snow on the steps so the front door will at least open. And after the holiday season we will try to find someone selling a cheap one way ticket to Florida. Actually I don't mind the snow a whole lot. At least you can watch people do strange things. Tuesday night while I was walking down Regent street two young men decided they would try sliding down the sidewalk on a piece of cardboard. Stuff like that makes me happy because I realize that snow doesn't drive me as crazy as it does some people.

Anyway from an anti-student Managing Editor who loves serving himself and putting out newspapers which are not really newspapers have a pleasant holiday break.

OPINION

The opinions found in Opinion are not necessarily the views of The Brunswickan

It's Soon Going to Become Time For a Real Ugly Backlash

by Iain Macpherson

Ostensibly, Tony Johnson-Tracy's "Opinion" column in last week's Brunswickan was an argument in defense of the "Politically Correct" movement. In truth, it will only appeal to totalitarian, neo-puritan, left-wing right-wingers like him. Those of us who truly resist "ideological conformity" on campus are treated to a glimpse inside the psyche of an extreme 'political corrector'. Even a reader as yet undecided on the issue can not help but be taken aback by the seeming rigidity of Mr. Johnson-Tracy's mind.

Apparently, the following ideas are out-of-date, and an obstruction to social justice: that people should try to listen attentively to even the most unattractive ideas, that people should be prepared for the possibility of change within their own ideas, that life might be a search for meaning rather than the assertion of doctrine, that too much dogma narrows the mind, and that no one has a monopoly on truth and justice. Apparently, anyone who believes in an unrestricted freedom of discourse, in the controversy and clash of varied ideas, in true 'multi-culturalism', is a bigot, sexist, homophobe, reactionary, conservative right-winger.

In my mind, and in the minds of many others nothing could be further from the truth. In my mind, it is Mr. Johnson-Tracy and his fellow ideologues who are right-wing and conservative. I think fascist tendencies and personalities are manifest in the PC movement, and that if it truly searches for the justice it claims to, then these elements must be rooted out. Otherwise the movement will never arouse anything in most intellects but reaction and opposition. Most thinking people react hostilely to being told what to do, say and think, it's that simple. And the more authoritarian the PC's become in their efforts to enforce and regulate "change", the stronger the scholarly, artistic and social backlash against them will become - I'm sure of it.

In an earlier letter, a Gary Craig reported that the American Civil Liberties Union supported a piece of legislation which indicated the ACLU's recognition of the 'fascist tendencies' of Politically Correct academic forces. As a supposed retort, Tony refers to the Republican rep. who sponsored this piece of legislation - "a notorious right-winger who would outlaw codes against hate literature and speech". And he quotes an ACLU leader, Jay Miller, who opposes the 'protection' of "racist, homophobic, and sexist kinds of things".

Many rational, intelligent people would oppose codes against 'hate' literature and speech, for a variety of reasons. One might be that suppressing unpleasant views does not make them go away, or change - it makes them fester, and bestows upon them 'rebel' status. Make anything taboo, and you glamorize it. Another reason might be the questioning of the standards used to decide what speech, literature or opinion is exactly 'hateful', 'racist', 'homophobic', or 'sexist'. Do we 'code against' or outlaw *Mein Kampf*? What about the writings of de Sade? What about Milton? The man was clearly sexist, an attitude clearly expressed in some of his best works. The same can be said of many writers, artists and philosophers. In fact, the charge 'hateful' can, with intellectual support, be levelled at most writings, in one form or another. Everything discriminates. Do we 'code against' Orwell's *1984* because it preaches hatred against proponents of socialist authoritarianism? Do we restrict the writings of Marx because he preaches hate against and the overthrow of capitalists? Do we outlaw the views of thinkers like Nietzsche or Camille Paglia because they don't seem to tell us to love-our-neighbours? For many intelligent people, the answer is varying degrees of yes. I am not one of them, but I can understand where they're coming from. Tony can't seem to accept that for many intelligent people the answer is no.

Jay Miller is also quoted as saying that people who oppose restriction on speech "represent the extreme right... the people who put the Reagan Revolution in place... and they're coming out for free speech for themselves". As many rock artists know, the 'extreme right' has never opposed restriction of expression; they just choose different views to censor and suppress than Miller and Johnson-Tracy do. I further resent the implication that as a proponent of the unrestricted freedom of discourse, I or people like me have anything to do with the "Reagan Revolution". For reasons of my own, which may actually be similar to Tony's, I might not be a big fan of Reagan. But Tony's implicit statement is that anyone who would vote for someone like Reagan is part of the campus reality which must be overcome. This is a university, not a left-wing training camp.

Tony claims that "the attack on political correctness has nothing to do with 'free speech', but rather is a well-orchestrated right-wing campaign against anyone who would challenge the prevailing status quo.". What utter rot! My attack has EVERYTHING to do with free speech, and the freedom of thought that comes with it. As for a "highly organized and well-funded movement", I have no idea what Tony's talking about. As far as I know, there is no organized opposition on this campus to the claims of the 'Politically Correct'. I have no idea who Andrew Gorman or Gary Craig are, and I'm sure that we're not led, and certainly not 'well-funded' by 'racists' such as Dinesh D' Souza. And I've never had the opportunity to read my 'bible', *Illiberal Education*.

Tony claims that resistance to the PC movement entails opposition to the social changes they claim to have brought about. I support many recent social reforms. However, I do not support them all, and all of them should be open to discussion.

He claims that "Right-wing crusaders against PC are only for free speech when it suits their purposes". Wrong again. Lots of people say things that I find offensive, but I never claim that they should be prevented from saying these things.

He claims that resistance to the PC movement is backed by a desire to return campuses to 'stultifying conformity', and that campus is an inhospitable place for "women, Blacks, lesbians and gays, radicals and socialists". I don't buy that, for the most part, campus is any less hospitable towards these groups than it is towards me. And what pockets of ignorance there are are not going to be changed by heavy-handed codes of speech which restrict us all. If "university campuses have become more conservative throughout the 1980's and into the 90's", then the alienating dogmatism, and the Stalinesque silencing and scare tactics of the extreme PC forces are at least partly to blame.

Despite Tony's claims that opposition to the extreme claims of the PC movement is well-organized, the truth is that I've finally fumed over enough Brunswickan editorials, columns and letters to get off my usually 'disinterested' butt and say some stuff about how I feel. Lots of my friends, and I suspect even most of the campus body feels the same way. So, if some people don't get a grip on their Stalin glands, I think its soon going to become time for a REAL 'ugly backlash'.