

THE BRUNSWICKAN OPINION & EDITORIAL

Editorial

More ways to beat people up

by Sean Patrick Sullivan
Editor-in-Chief

The United States is at it again.

In line with their plans for Iraq, the government's Defense Science Board (DSB) has recently finished a report recommending the US continue in making their war on terrorism preemptive and proactive.

Nothing new, eh? Sure, every month we hear of a new terror warning. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld goes on television to warn that some dastardly group of villains (see picture on page seven) has concocted a sinister plan that places the United States (and its friends, of course) in great peril.

Of course, those warnings (which come in red, orange, yellow, blue and green) never really amount to much, and the general attitude of the States is to sit back, see what happens, then go beat up whoever might have known someone who knew who did it. Whew.

These principles of defense are further outlined in this new report, which recommends a "Proactive Preemptive Operations Group" (PGOP) to, according to United Press International, "devise ways to stimulate terrorists into responding or moving operations." You know... steal their money, kill their family, mix drugs into the whole deal: whatever needs to be done for the terrorist groups to strike back. According to UPI, it reads in

parts "like a fantastical 'spy vs. spy' manual."

This approach would be like the United States poking a stick into an ant hill, swirling it around a bit, then blaming the ants for biting it.

Sounds like the lazy way of taking over the world. It also sounds like Operation Northwoods, an early 1960's plan dreamed up by America's top military brass to fool the American public into believing a war with Cuba (and Fidel Castro) was necessary. According to ABC news, the plans included violence against Cuban refugees, "hijacking planes, blowing up a US ship, and even orchestrating violent terrorism in US cities," all to gain the public's support.

Back then JFK rejected the plan; now, with the United States eager to "look after" the rest of the world, they're willing to provoke terrorist acts on their country (and maybe ours, we're pretty close by...). Again, they're going to make an elite task force to stir up terrorists, get them to strike (read: kill) Americans, and then the States are going to strike back.

These strikes are to justify American occupations like that in Afghanistan right now, and the one that is sure to hit Iraq soon. It's all about taking over the world, and most notably the world's oil reserves. Bush and his friends are taking over the world one step at a time, and sadly, there's not much anyone can do about it.

Mugwump

Hooray for the cowboys

by Ben Conoley
Managing Editor

Wednesday was a sad, sad day, as political history was made in the United States. For the first time ever, the Republican Party has control of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the presidency. They also make up the majority of the country's governors to boot.

Tuesday's elections, which drew just over one third of eligible voters to the polling stations, essentially give George W Bush permission to push anything he wishes through the system and into the books. The United States' frequently celebrated division of power has become virtually ineffective, with the Democrats' only hope being the possibility of the occasional runaway Republican wishing to please his/her constituency.

So, were you already angry about the US government's action against Afghanistan, their anxiousness to lace up their combat boots and head over to Iraq, or their socially destructive plans to save a buck or two? Well, brace yourself.

What's to blame for such a weak show of support for the Democrats? Why, when historically the president's party tends to fare poorly in the mid-term elections, did Bush's team come through so strong?

Perhaps it's the wartime atmosphere in the United States right now. Driving through Massachusetts on Thanksgiving I was visually assaulted by an array of star spangled slogans touting the country's battle-ready testosterone levels.

Because everything is political

Animals have rights too

by Tan-Nee Ng

As someone deeply concerned with animal rights, the most annoying and seemingly pointless question I have ever been asked is: "If your house was burning and you could only save your child or your dog, who would you save?" Another popular variant has also been, "If you were stuck on an island and had to kill to survive or starve to death, would you kill and eat an animal?"

I believe the question (and answer) has nothing to do with animal rights whatsoever, despite its blatant attempt at getting us to give preference to human concerns over animal concerns, to thus prove...what? I can guarantee you that not only would I save my own child from a burning house rather than my dog, but that I would also save my own child instead of 12 other children! But I do think that looking more deeply at these kinds of "emergency situation" questions tells us something about our society and our very own human attitudes towards animals.

Because we consider animals to be

property in our society, almost every conflict of interest between human and non-human animals is essentially turned into a "burning house." If Ned proposed that we had to balance our interests against those of our possessions (such as our cars and Abercrombie & Finch t-shirts), we would probably think Ned was crazy! After all, cars and Abercrombie & Finch t-shirts are properties that have no morally significant interests and are merely things that have no value except that which we (as owners) give to them.

Thus, because we consider animals to be property, we are able to ignore their interests by inflicting pain and suffering on them when it is economically beneficial to us. In short, the human desire to use an animal for economic gain or personal pleasure (i.e. eating meat or wearing fur) is considered more important than the animals' desire to not be killed, mutilated, or enslaved. All other rights are meaningless unless a human or nonhuman animal is granted the basic right not to be the property of another.



Stephanie Brunet/The Brunswickan

"Snow can wait, I forgot my mittens... I get a little warm in my heart when I think of winter." - Tori Amos, 'Winter'

A Chretien legacy: ten years of empty promises

by Justin Sadler

In the past months, and since Chretien's latest throne speech, political adversary has come to find new meaning. There has been much debate over our Prime Minister's decision to remain in office until February of 2004. It is a debate among all politicians alike and it has spawned this most recent attempt to oust Chretien from office.

The motion set forth by Alliance leader Stephen Harper, Paul Martin's newest lapdog, was a proposal that committee chairs be elected by secret ballot. It is a motion that has created a stir within the Liberal Party. Chretien has opposed the measure from its inception, and has pleaded for his caucus to also reject it. However, it was Martin, the Liberal black sheep, who originally posed the idea. He and his supporters, who naturally favor the motion as well, have created a very public display of a divided caucus. And although Chretien and his Liberals have downplayed it, his cheap attempt to mask the division in his party will not go unnoticed. Now that the government has lost the vote, 174 to 87, who knows what will ensue henceforth?

It is obvious that Prime Minister Jean Chretien is nearing the end of his nine year reign as Canada's twentieth Prime Minister. Regardless of how that end should come, and regardless of his supposed "forty years of hard work," Chretien's debatable legacy is on the verge of realization. He, however, seems to be struggling with the fact that he will have no comparable legacy to Mulroney's North American Free Trade Agreement, or more importantly, Trudeau's patriation of the constitution.

If I was writing a history of Chretien's last term in office, I'm not sure if any part of the Throne Speech would be included in his legacy. The overzealous speech focused on countless issues like increasing funding for health care, early childhood education, Kyoto ratification, families with poor children, foreign aid, and aboriginals. And as CBC Radio's national affairs correspondent, Anthony Germain, reported, "This throne speech is really something of a photocopy of the last catalogue of promises that were made in the throne speech of January 2001.



The last one talked about working with the provinces and adding more funding to health care, increasing the National Child Benefit, [and] reducing greenhouse gas emissions." How many times are the Liberals going to dig up the 1993 red book before they begin to act?

PC leader Joe Clark stated in his response on CBC television, "there is nothing new in this speech that justified shutting down parliament, and if there are new promises here, they are only new promises that the Liberal government will break." Of the new promises, such as the consideration of decriminalizing marijuana, changing the way political parties are funded, and clamping down on lobbyists, none were of the greatest magnitude to put forth the costly expense of calling a throne speech.

Maybe Chretien's defining moments will prove to be the empty promises that have plagued his government over the years. Sure, maybe the sly Liberals have slithered by with balanced budgets, but it was the same government who in 1993 vowed to protect Canada's public health care and public education. It was the same government that implemented the deepest funding cuts to health care and education in history. And it was the same government that did so to erase a budget deficit. Chretien and his Liberals broke their promise to rid Canada of GST, and instead they have hinted at raising it even higher to help pay for their new commitments to revitalizing a healthcare system that has been ruthlessly stripped of funding for the past nine years.

Political rhetoric aside, one must

Look outside the mainstream for quality news

by Tyler Brand

(U-WIRE) TUCSON, Ariz. — The mass media has never been my favourite corporate monkey.

In my more foolish days, I would spend hours in a CNN/Fox induced coma, waiting zombie-like for any semblance of relevant information so I

could go back to drawing on myself or some similarly productive task, confident that I was still a stud in the pasture of current events.

Likewise, I never really minded the talk show hosts. It was probably my morbid curiosity that led me to watch Larry King swing from nodding blankly and drooling to passionately sucking the

THE BRUNSWICKAN

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief • Sean Patrick Sullivan
Managing Editor • Ben Conoley
News Editor • Kora Stapelfeldt
Sports Editor • Cindy Brown
Entertainment Editor • Patrick Reinartz
Acting Photo Editor • Stephanie Brunet

Games Co-ordinator • Michael Edwards
Graphics Design • David MacCoubrey
Online Editor • Jeff Smith

Staff

Advertising Sales Representative • Bill Traer
Administrator • K Brookland
Proofreader • Jodi Magliaro
Delivery • Kathleen MacPhee

Contributors

Emma Hutchman, Mark Cameron, David MacCoubrey, TJ Essensa, Andrew Hill, Tan-Nee Ng, Nathan White, Justin Sadler, Troy Neilson, Alex White, Amy Batt, Stefan Robak, Jeremy Elder, Burt Muston, Brendan Doyle, Zita Nyarady, Michael Edwards, Kirby Arbeau, Gavin Simms, Shane Martin

About us

The Brunswickan, in its 136th year of publication, is Canada's Oldest Official Student Publication.

We are an autonomous student newspaper owned and operated by Brunswickan Publishing Inc., a non-profit, independent body.

We are a founding member of the Canadian University Press, and love it so. We are also members of U-Wire, a media exchange of university media throughout North America. We publish weekly during the academic year with a circulation of 10,000.

Editorial policy

While we endeavour to provide an open forum for a variety of viewpoints and ideas, we may refuse any submission considered by the editorial board to be racist, sexist, libellous, or in any way discriminatory.

The opinions and views expressed in this newspaper are those of the individual writers, and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Brunswickan, its Editorial Board, or its Board of Directors.

All editorial content appearing in The Brunswickan is the property of Brunswickan Publishing Inc. Stories, photographs, and artwork contained herein cannot be reproduced without the express, written permission of the Editor-in-Chief.

Letters to the editor

We usually will not publish letters containing attacks of a strictly personal nature. The Brunswickan reserves the right to edit for length, spelling, and grammar. The Brunswickan reserves the right not to publish any letter. Letters to The Editor must be less than 300 words in length, though exceptions may be made. All submissions must contain your name, student number and a phone number. ID will be checked when submissions are dropped off at the editorial office of The Brunswickan, otherwise verification will be done by phone.

The Brunswickan
21 Pacey Drive, Suite 35
Fredericton, NB, E3B 5A3

main office • (506) 453-4983
advertising • (506) 452-6099
fax • (506) 453-5073

web • www.unb.ca/bruns
email • bruns@unb.ca

This issue is dedicated to:
Sleep - if only we could.

Please recycle this newspaper.

realize that the Liberal government will be making a transition to a new leader, and the problems at hand are not ones that can be solved within the next eighteen months. The plan within the government's presented agenda really requires the sustained effort and a perpetual budget over the course of five to ten years. The Liberal's plan to unveil the new budget in February 2003 will diminish the chances of legislature accomplishing anything within a year. Although Chretien's power is going to dissolve in 2004, maybe the highlight of his last term in office will be how he tied the hands of his successor.

I commend Paul Martin for his public display of dissent. Although the motion may not be of the greatest magnitude to suggest a vote of non-confidence, Martin's dissent represents much more than a divided caucus. It represents a movement away from the party line, and a movement towards responsible government. It represents a slight loosening of the knot.

buttocks of his guests, gape at Hannity and Colmes as they disgrace their respective ideologies, and see Alan Keyes flaunt his collection of sweater vests.

I learned very little from these bubbles in the media sewer (except how everyone spins everything and how al Qaeda

(SEE QUALITY NEWS, PAGE 6)