

# Letters to the editor

To the Editor:

I wish to respond, yet again, to another of your beloved, yet hopelessly flawed "exposes", in this case, Peter Gillis's article on the Soc/Anth department.

My intention is not to steal the modus operandi of Peter's little column and trash his person; while I could, and perhaps should, just for fun, the ink would be better spent on clarifying the number of lies--yes lies--you are trying to push on the unsuspecting populace of UPEI. Perhaps we should start calling you "Big Brother". In any case, I will point out the facts to you, Peter--as I would have told them to you, had you interviewed me, before you embarrassed yourself.

For starters, no students threatened Jennifer Caseley at any time. Nor did we visit your office 'nearly a dozen times'--maybe four, if that. How do I know this? Because, as Soc/Anth Society President, myself and my executive were informed of all such visits. The score in the first period: Drake 1, Gillis 0.

Second, the charge that student's marks suffered due to side-taking is utterly fallacious. If you had cared enough for the truth as most good journalists do (see the handbook, Petie), you would have interviewed the people you so carelessly speak for...though you give no concrete occurrences. Why? Because there are none. How do I know this? Because I as Student Representative, informally asked each major if such thing was occurring. NOT ONE MAJOR HAD A PROBLEM WITH ANYONE BUT THE PANTHER PRINTS. Score: Drake 2, Gillis 0.

Thirdly, Students fully realized the purpose of the self-study--and yes, Peter, it did include a rather lengthy section on student concerns. And

yet none reflect the problems of which you speak. Rather, students were concerned with things like Honours programs, more electives, and so on. Where is the fear of retribution, Peter? The score at the end of the second: Drake 3, Gillis 0.

Fourthly, the charge that students weren't given chances to air their concerns to reviewers is unabashedly false. Students were allotted 2 to 4 hours with each reviewer, to raise WHATEVER CONCERN THEY HAD. How do I know this? Because I notified students both meetings, and can find at least thirty who attended to vouch for the truth of it. Drake 4, Gillis 0.

Games over, folks. Gotta finish up now, or the editors'll cut me short.

To sum up then, I am requesting, on behalf of the students of Sociology/Anthropology, a full and public apology from Peter Gillis, who unashamedly lied about their sentiments and realities for the sake of two pages of trash. Had you given at least one example, Peter, the story would have had some merit. Yet, you did not, and so it reeks of fabrication.

I close with this: *If students of sociology/anthropology are so disgruntled and upset with their department, why did you receive a record number of letters condemning Jennifer's article?*

Sorry again, Peter, but this time we know the score, and you lose.

MICHAEL G. DRAKE

President, Soc/Anth Society

Student Rep, Soc/Anth Department

Senate Representative, UPEISU

Dear Cadre,

"Okay, here's the deal". You are a student at a small university with almost no clue as to what you are doing and you write at least one article for the student newspaper weekly. I have been following Peter Gillis' column "Sacred Cows" since the beginning of the school year and what really scares me is that he is so convincing, yet he's rather clueless himself. The worst thing about it is that he is Rude and Insulting. So this week, as a reader, I've decided to fight back. Let's take last week's article for example. First of all, Petie, why do you hate "Mah Epperly" (re. "Sacred Cows" October 7, 1997) so much? Is it because she's a ...a ....woman...and she's a ....a... President? Is there a reason why you feel the need to degrade President Epperly by presenting her as lazy enough to "bury the issue to get home in time for Friends"? In my opinion Epperly has cared a lot more and made a lot more progress in contrast to Eliot who did nothing but practice his accent all day. I guess in Petie's mind better to have a male President who does nothing than a progressive WOMAN (shh! bad word). In reference to Pete's real issue at hand in this article, the problems within the Soc/Anth department, doesn't it say, in an article that he co-wrote, "The Legacy of soc/anth", that Dean Smith did "not find evidence that tensions between Department members are interfering with the teaching and learning carried out in Sociology and Anthropology classes..." in his decanal review. So where is Dean Smith's blame in all of this?? It is my understanding that although the President recommended an external review of the department, "one that would cover both curriculum and the accusations against several professors", the latter of the two issues was never reviewed. Was the President supposed to squash the Dean's review and demand another external review anyway? I really don't know what the situation is, but I think administration is a lot more complicated with all it's tags, go back to jails, snakes, and red tape than Petie understands. Obviously Petie, like any child, lives at the center of his universe, and doesn't comprehend how systems work. You should know, it doesn't work to run right to Mamma and tell on your big brothers and sisters, or even Dad. That's how families get really dysfunctional. So Petie, just to end off, biased marking is an 'internal affair', not a rationalization. If you worked a McDonald's and you forgot the key for your morning shift, would you phone Ronald? I don't think we have Deans for nothing, and I don't think the President is the be-all end-all of decisions. As far as I can see, a president's main job at any university is to raise money. There is more than one person around that round table, and Petie, you act more like Hitler than Epperly. Grow up!

Sincerely,

a concerned Cadre reader.

**All submissions to The Cadre must include the writer's full name, contact phone number, and student number, if applicable. (Though a pen name may be substituted in the printed copy)**

**Letters to the editor must be kept to fewer than 400 words. The editor reserves the right to truncate letters due to space constraints. All submissions must be received by 5PM on Thursdays.**