

Continued from page five

all faculties, you may be surprised to discover that someone in another department or faculty may have direct experience with a teaching innovation you are considering. Or you may be planning a departmental workshop on a particular topic and would like to know if there is an expert right on campus who could help plan or even participate in the workshop.

The committee is also willing to organize seminars and workshops of a general nature on almost any topic related to teaching and learning, and is open to suggestions from both faculty and students. Requests should be received very soon in order to plan for the second term.

The committee works closely with Learning Resource Services and through this affiliation has established contact with similar organizations at a number of other Canadian universities. As a result, a body of information has been gathered on such topics as designing student evaluation questionnaires, materials for planning specific workshops, faculty evaluation profiles, curriculum design, mediated instruction (television, computer etc.), improving lectures, and more.

The Senate Committee needs to hear from you in order to exchange ideas and information through its planned newsletter. Please contact any of the members to have an item brought to its attention, or contact the Secretary directly for more information on any of areas above (phone 424-2404).

Membership includes Professors S.E. York (Medicine, Chairman); E.T. Marriott (Education and Student Services, Secretary); T. Carter (Learning Resources); R. Evans (Fac. Law); S. Wong (School of Nursing); R. Morris (School Social Work); K. Heard (Political Science); P. Blahut (Fac. Dentistry); N. Erskine (Student Council); B. Sithole (DAGS).

E.T. Marriott  
Secretary

University Committee on Teaching & Learning

## CKDU Manager responds

To the Editor:

Re: "CKDU and the fall of the bearded ones"  
Gazette, Nov. 18/82

Flattery may be the most sincere form of insult. Although I am certain the article was published with the very best of intentions, I am afraid its opinions tended to polarize the issue into artificial categories.

If a complaint was meant then it should not have been made at the expense of the hard work of others. It should have been offered simply on its own merits.

Items like "CKDU and the fall of the bearded ones" serve no good aim, and in the end only cause more confusion. Confusion only hurts all involved.

To make matters worse, one of the authors is a member of the station executive. His interest in the station goes above and beyond that of the casual listener. He also received no encouragement to publish that article. In fact, I tried to dissuade him.

I only hope that the rhetoric, on both sides, will cease and CKDU will be able to serve as a campus information source, rather than a home for contending elites.

Yours respectfully,  
Derrick Daniels  
CKDU Station Manager

## The Israel-Arab conflict: Fact clarification

To the Editor:

In "Israel on the table; taking a look at the facts" (Dalhousie Gazette, November 4/82), Caroline Zayid describes certain reports and events which, isolated and out of context, are misleading: Israel is made out as fundamentally brutal and aggressive from its foundations to the present. Such an assertion is absurd. By revealing other relevant details it is possible to show a "pro-Israeli" point of view regarding each one of these reports and events. Any journalist (or politician) knows that you can pick your facts and figures to suit your story or claim. So let us take a step back.

What is the point of looking at facts? Ideally, to get a clear idea of what is true and what is false; one can then make rational decisions and achieve a rational state of affairs. But in the situation in the Middle East today there is a primary truth which is undeniable: both Jews and Arabs are human in every respect and each must have the means and the ability to achieve "national self determination".

The story of Deir Yassin is true. It is also true that, in 1948, many Jewish villagers were likewise slaughtered by invading Arab forces. It is true that, throughout their history, Palestinian Arabs have been "used" by European States and other Arab rulers in political power games. It is true that, throughout their history, Jews have been "used" by whoever had political power in the state in which they dwelt.

It is true that approximately six million Jews were murdered during the years 1939-1945 because they were Jews, and this trauma has become ingrained in Jewish consciousness. In this context, consider the Palestine National Covenant (Cairo 1968), Article 9: "The Palestinian Arab people affirms its absolute resolution...to pursue the armed struggle...to liberate its homeland...and exercise sovereignty over it." Article 20: "...the Jews are not one people with an independent identity...". Many Jewish people interpret this document literally:

the intention to destroy Israel and its population and that is the Jewish identity.

It is not for Arabs to determine the destiny of Jews, nor is it for Jews to determine the destiny of Arabs. Rather, all must work together, building on whatever foundations exist, acknowledging injustices and always looking toward real peace in the long term rather than short term gain. To do this requires the immediate courage and strength, far more than to pick up a gun and shoot. I suggest to Caroline Zayid that her commentary, in the long run, is counter productive to her goals because it engenders hostility rather than cooperation.

We live in the present. Let us acknowledge injustice, great pain, and together build with all that we share.

Sincerely,  
Geoffrey E. Katz  
(Environmental Planning, NSCAD)

## Tradition for its own sake?....

To the Editor:

In last week's letter to the editor ("Gears boss bashes Gazette"), the president of the Dal Engineering Society said that "the engineers find it unfortunate that the Gazette must deal with the (annual stamping of the paper) in such an unprofessional manner".

In making this statement the Engineers finally did something that made me laugh.

Ignoring or laughing off the Engineers' attempt to attract attention by damaging property is not exactly "professional" (nor is the ploy itself, more to the point).

The most professional manner in which victims of willful damage can respond is to demand retribution - this the Gazette has done.

Also, I don't find "the necessity of tradition to an engineering student" incomprehensible, as Bernard suggests. I understand all too well the phenomenon of insecure, irrational people mindlessly following 'tradition'.

The Engineers' tradition of stamping Gazettes is not only destructive, it is stupid.

Yours truly,  
M.L. Hendry  
(former Gazette staffer)

## Let the Gazette start its own!

To the Editor:

I read with interest Carrie Bernard's comments in last week's Gazette re-the stamping of newspapers by members of the Engineering Society. I can appreciate Ms. Bernard's position - she could hardly be expected to condemn the actions of a group of which she is President. However, in this case, I think Ms. Bernard would have been wiser to refrain from comment, rather than present such a ludicrous defence.

The logical arguments against stamping the Gazette have already been discussed at length. The bottom line is quite simple - stamping costs the Gazette money, and that is a big problem for a campus newspaper struggling to pay a large portion of its own way. However, according to Ms. Bernard, any loss to the Gazette is of little consequence when compared to the vast importance of 'tradition' to the Engineering Society. But does sleazy vandalism really become good clean fun just because it happens year after year?

No matter. Let it not be said that the staff of the Dalhousie Gazette is not open to suggestion. We are apparently missing out on one of life's great experiences, so in an attempt to develop a greater appreciation of the madness behind such methods, we've decided to establish a 'tradition' of our own. Beginning on December 1 of this year, in what we hope will become an annual event, the staff of the Dalhousie Gazette will kidnap the President of the Engineering Society, shave his or her head, and stamp all of that gleaming white space with an appropriate message.

The absurdity of such a plan should be obvious even to the Engineers. And yet, following the logic put forth in Ms. Bernard's letter, the action could be justified with a scream of "TRADITION". Sorry, but it just doesn't wash. Stamping Gazettes is a cheap, selfish trick, one that does little to enhance the Engineers' reputation.

In closing I will remind the Society of two things:

- 1) Contrary to what was implied in your letter, there were not any windows smashed in the Engineering House.
- 2) The Engineering Society still owes the Gazette \$750.00.

Sincerely,  
Judy Steele,  
Ad. manager, Dalhousie Gazette

## Someone has to be first...

To the Editor:

In reply to J.E. MacInnis' letter, titled "Disarmament a 'noble gesture'?" (Gazette, Nov. 18) - I think that the point MacInnis makes is the underlying reason given for the reluctance of the Americans to dismantle their weapons - are we guaranteed that the Soviet Union and Red China will also dismantle? However, I believe that the awareness of just what kinds of hideous damage and suffering are caused by nuclear warfare changes this question. All of mankind has a desire for life, whether he be Russian, American, black, yellow, old or young. I am sure that the Russians and Chinese wouldn't want to have their skins melted off by a nuclear blast any more than we do. The world leaders all recognize this, but

they continue to threaten all of our lives with their nuclear pile-ups. Wouldn't it be much more honourable for the Americans to be the first to stand up for all mankind and dismantle their weapons? Americans' fear of meeting the Russians as fellow men, as opposed to faceless enemies who also have bombs, shows that the American ideology is really no better than the Russian (or Chinese) - for, as long as there are nuclear weapons, (one can claim to be defending the good of all mankind).

Signed,  
KimRilda van Feggelen

## Staff democracy under fire

To the Editor:

Your commentary "On pick-ups, stereotypes and taking a stand" contained some inaccuracies. It was *not* the Gazette staff who decided not to print Rusty & Dave's "Girls & Bucks" article, but the editor alone. When the staff was approached to condone the move, there was so much controversy that the vote showed more abstentions than 'ayes' or 'nays'. The discussion was postponed until the next week so that the staff could think about the issue.

There were two basic questions to be answered. (1) Was the article sexist?, and (2) Should it be printed? There were also many associated issues. I feel personally that the ensuing staff meeting served only the purpose of the editor himself and those who agreed with his views. Some viable suggestions as to how the issue should be handled, proposed by myself and others, were pointedly disregarded. The question of how much freedom should be given to staff writers was left up in the air. Grounds and regulations for any future censorship of this kind were not discussed. When one of the fundamental issues at hand was brought up once more, *Is the article sexist or not?*, one staff member, who agreed with the editor on the issue, said "Do we have to go through all that again?". In other words, the member seemed to consider that the editor's judgement on the article as sexist was to be accepted. After token allowances for other views, the question was then put forward as "Should a sexist article be printed?" This seemed pointless when many staff members, including myself, did not think the article was sexist.

I sincerely commend the editor on his move to put the R & D article in *Commentary*, and also for his effort at obtaining staff consensus on the issue. However, it seems that for the process to truly earn the name "staff democracy", the ideas and suggestions made by *all* staff members should be equally considered, not simply endured and disregarded.

I will state my personal suggestions clearly in writing.

- (1) R & D should, considering the nature of their column, be given the benefit of the doubt in all but the most extreme cases.
- (2) The Gazette can absolve itself of any direct blame for *any* article by placing a short note at the bottom of the R & D column saying they do not necessarily condone or agree with the contents of the article.

I feel this is the only way the writers concerned would be able to write a humorous and often risqué column without having the dread of censorship hanging over their heads.

Anya Waite

## Angel dust

To the Editor:

It is interesting that R. Purver of the Centre for Foreign Policy Studies was moved to publicly thank the Gazette so warmly for putting him "on the side of the Angels" (*Nuclear Corrections*, Nov. 11).

"I was absolutely delighted," he wrote, "to find myself included 'on the side of the angels' as supporting arms control - which I do, contrary to the impression apparently gained by most of the commentators and questioners from the audience that I am an inveterate reactionary militarist warmonger."

Mr. Purver has become defensive, but no less smug about the vital question of war and peace.

It was this same false, and demagogic, counterposition for which he was attacked.

Statements from the audience: (1) opposed the attempt to portray Purver, the Canadian government and the two superpowers, as peacemakers, let alone to provide him with a platform to do propaganda for NATO and the theory of the necessity to maintain a "balance of power";

(2) that the main theme behind all this propaganda about "arms control" and "nuclear disarmament" is in fact the declaration of the two superpowers and their allies that the people of the world have no choice but to submit to the imperialist war preparations, both "nuclear" and conventional; that the only "choice" is between an imperialist world war or an imperialist "peace" whereby the USA and the USSR work out some deals; and that the only choice for the people is to be under the "umbrella" of one or the other superpower;

(3) that these theories and stands are consistent with a Centre which has received over \$430,000 from DND and \$480,000 from the U.S. Donner Foundation of the Rockefeller-Mellon group of finance capital.

Dr. P. Cappon of the City of Halifax publicly confirmed that the financing from the Canadian government for the "two days on disarmament" and the Linus Pauling tour was

Continued on page six