

Letters to the Editor

OUR POLICY ON LETTERS

Letters to the Editor should be no longer than 500 words and should be either typed, or on disk. Letters longer than 500 words will be ended with a curt \. Submissions that do not include a name and phone number will not be printed. Pseudonyms may be used after consultation with the editor. We reserve the right to clarify factual errors. We do not edit for content, correct spelling, or fix your grammar. All letters are printed verbatim. That means every spelling error or misplaced punctuation mark is printed. No endless debate please. The Panther Prints will exercise discretion in printing letters that are racist, homophobic or sexist. All letters must be received by Thursday at 5pm.

The opinions expressed in the Letters to the Editor section of the Panther Prints do not necessarily represent the views of anyone on staff, at the Student Union, at UPEI, or anywhere on the planet.

In response to the over whelming number of letters to the editor we received this week, the Panther Prints has decided to print no more than 5 letters to the editor in any given week from this issue on.

For those unfamiliar with the term libel, the Oxford Dictionary defines it as:

n. 1. a) a published false statement damaging to a person's reputation b) the act or crime of publishing this. 2. a) a false and defamatory written statement.

Dear Editor,

I would like to respond to Jennifer Caseley's "article" called Digging Up Dirt on The Soc/Anth Dept. A more appropriate title for the article might have been "The Five Minutes Killed" or "The Shoddy journalism/diatribes maligning Bruce Holbrook's character".

I took exception to many of the things you said, beginning with the paragraph outlining "the course of events leading up to her breakdown have caused some concern for the students at U.P.E.I. Maybe you should reconsider treading on the dangerous grounds of linking Bruce Holbrook with Rachel's manic-depressive breakdown. Later in the article you state "The whole ordeal was more than Rachel could handle and within two weeks of receiving a mark of 49% on a paper, her manic depression took over and she was hospitalised." Maybe you should do a little research on mental illness and you would probably see that a breakdown was not the fault of Professor Holbrook or the failing grade she received.

I do not speak for anyone but myself, but I want you to know that your attempts to besmirch Bruce Holbrook's reputation hurt me as a student of his. I have taken every course that Bruce has offered and hold him in the highest regard. He has been nothing but professional, fair, and freely encourages ideas while remaining extremely approachable. He is a person I truly admire and has raised my consciousness to a higher level, something I cannot say about any other professor.

I suggest to you Jennifer that you get some formal training in Journalism and practice some fairness and research before you end up with anymore egg on your face.

Sincerely your 100% Bruce supporter,
Paula McNally

Dear Editor

Dig up all the dirt you wish but the article "Digging up Dirt on the Soc/Anth Dept" was inaccurate insensitive and prejudicial. I was in the class where this incident began. Inaccurate because no one tried to deny anyone's privilege to obtain help from other professors. Get a life man her

manic depression which you use as your sympathy card was caused by his event. But you and your witch-hunter friend do her no favor by perpetuating this unreality. Your paper should go back to discussing sex surveys, for your attempt at investigative journalism leaves much to be desired.

Francis O'Donnell

Enquirer or Panther Prints?

It might seem to the uninformed reading of, "Digging Up The Dirt on The Soc/Anth by Jennifer Caseley," that the views expressed within are those of a factual nature. However facts have very little to do with this article. It would seem that Ms. Caseley is a propagandist of ambiguities and grossly misinterpreted information. How so you ask?

An ethical reporter does not only refer to one side of an argument (let alone having a one sided argument based on inaccurate information) but realizes that it is in her, and thus the readers best interest, to show both sides. In doing this the reader is able to make his or her own mind up instead of having this task done for them. An ethical reporter also does not paraphrase a quotation incorrectly or take the quotation entirely out of context. Perhaps Ms. Caseley believes that the students of U.P.E.I. are unable to think and are therefore unaware of her misconstrued article.

When Ms. Caseley starts her story off she reports that one of the students who had problems with of the Soc/Anth professors was a manic depressive. What does this have to do with anything? Is this some sort of empathy ploy in order to win support for her biased reporting? It would seem to me that this has little to do with whether or not professors in the department are at odds, as does the equating of the Enquirer to the Panther Prints. Wait a minute, on second thought that sounds more true than false.

Also Ms. Caseley appears flawed in her facts. For instance she reports that Dr. Holbrook is not easily accessible. However, if she had interviewed, oh I don't know maybe more than on student, she would have realized he is extremely easy to reach. For instance in all of the classes I have taken with this professor one of the first things he does is write his home phone number on the board. He explains to his students that you can call him anytime about anything.

As for ambiguities, Ms. Caseley implied that Dr. Holbrook said that seeing as he had tenure he was above the law. Well I was there when this was allegedly said. A NOTE TO ALL THIS WAS NOT WHAT WAS SAID. He did not say, "...remember when filling them out that he would be teaching them next semester." In fact Dr. Holbrook was alerting students to the fact that the present system of student evaluations could be improved so that students could better voice their concerns. As I recall, Dr. Holbrook said that he wanted students to be honest on their student evaluations.

Ms. Caseley has obviously demonstrated *her lack of professionalism* in her journalistic skill. I hope that in the future she will report the whole story and not some twisted fabrication.

Jason Doucette