

Nigeria's actions immoral?

Dear Editor,

I would be very thankful if you would allow me a space to air my views on Abdella Abdou's article of April 6, 1983 issue of the Aquinian.

Abdella, it is really a sad state of affairs that at the present stage of deliberations about Nigeria's deportation of illegal immigrants, after so many questions have been raised and discussed, you then wake up from your deep sleep to spill out statements that only manifest your parochial chauvinism.

Were you skeptical that your article might not be published? I certainly think so because the number of contradictions you made in the article were too many to elude attention. I would rather not point them out; read it over carefully yourself. Secondly, you were just "jumping" about and randomly criticizing everyone which made your article very disjointed and full of loose ends.

However, I thank you for at least admitting that Nigeria was legally right in her action. Your contention is that Nigeria's action is immoral, or more to the point, it fails to satisfy your standards of morality. First, you don't seem to realize that morality is too broad a concept for one person to define. There are a great number of "variables" you should bring in before you can pass judgement on Nigeria. You have deliberately ignored those other variables. Besides, I would love to know who has made you the "international moralist" to decide what every country should do to be morally right? If you

could just, for a short while, step out from the cherished domain of your imagination, bigotry and vacuous sentimentality and take an objective look at the article on the front page of the Thursday, April 7, issue of the Daily Gleaner, perhaps, (with respect to your feigned feelings about world migrant workers) you may begin to understand where the real threat to morality lies.

Abraham, you ridicule Nigeria, saying that her golden days are now over, and that her economy has slumped so low, but still you accuse her of lacking morality by asking illegal immigrants to leave. It is always easy for someone to sit back and criticize others because it appears to be fun and most often it doesn't cost anything. Would you just take some minutes and put down your understanding (connotations) of a country's morality on a sheet of paper and then evaluate your very own country based on that. You are hammering on the contributions of these illegal immigrants to Nigerian economy. Now that they have been asked to leave, why don't you write your own country's government to admit just half of these people, so that you may have a feel for their contributions to economic growth.

You are talking about inter-dependency of nations and questioning where Nigerian laws were when these people entered the country, as if you were from another planet. On inter-dependency, suffice it to say there are several millions of

migrant workers still employed in Nigeria. They are those who cared to enter the country through the normal channel. If you are willing to widen your perceptual horizon a little more, I would suggest you take a look at the geography of the country you are talking about. Perhaps you would appreciate the impracticability of putting a guard on every spot on the border. Hopefully, you will realize how anyone could have meandered his/her way into the country and the absurdity of asking such a question. It is logical and pragmatic that movement of people from one country to another is duly monitored. Every country has the right to, at least, to know who is coming in and from where he/she is coming. Any person who has the audacity to enter another country without the necessary documentation should not take offense if

he/she is only asked to back track.

According to your article, they belong to the world's migrant workers. I don't refute that. It means then that the problems should be shared proportionately across the globe. Why then do you assume that the number is a fair share for Nigeria alone and how many of the world's migrant workers are employed by your country? There are internationally agreed conditions and rules regarding entering and working in another country. It is an inalienable right of each country to formulate and enforce immigration policies in conformity to these internationally agreed guidelines.

If the world considers eliminating all immigration laws and forming into one country so as to resolve the issue of illegal migrant workers once and for all, I am positive that Nigeria will vote yes. And, if the world

decides to rotate all unemployed people from one country to the other for a certain agreed period, I am also positive that Nigeria will vote yes.

By those contradictory and disconnected statements one is made to feel that you are disoriented, disorganized and confused.

Abdella, you are not being fair by trying to take advantage of a situation that is supposed to be of global concern, to seek a "nice guy" status for your country. To seal yourself up in your study cubicle and assume that Nigeria has a moral obligation to, not only take care of her 82 million citizens, but also accept several million legal immigrants and an extra 2 million illegal immigrants is, in the light of the present economic and social condition; unreasonable, irrational and unrealistic.

Emmanuel Dike

A comment from the editor

What is the difference between what Gerard Finnan did and what Oliver Koncz did? Oliver Koncz' defense is that he was not aware he was violating Student Union policy but ignorance is no defense at all. The fact that he did not know the policy concerning Yearbook revenue shows his incompetence as Yearbook business manager. I

have to wonder what would have happened had it been the Brunswickan's business manager who had violated the policy. What of CHSR's of Orientation's treasurer? Would Bosnitch have defended them?

It is bad enough that Koncz was able to get away with what he did, but he also had the gall to demand his commission before turn-

ing over the money. I am glad that Darren Evans did not give in.

To further prove Koncz's incompetence, he paid commission to those who sold yearbooks directly from the Yearbook's revenue. This is the duty of the Student Union. When asked to resign, Koncz refused. This being the case, council should vote for his removal.

Liquor license

cont from page 3
to prevent anyone it wishes from remaining on campus, because the land is private property.

The directive met with a small amount of opposition from some of the students present, but was generally accepted. When finalized, it will be forwarded to the breweries.

As student input is vitally important in the discussion of any changes to the liquor licensing procedures, all students are invited to

make comments to Dean Thompson. If no great hurdles are encountered, a blanket liquor licence may be in place for the fall term.

at CHSC
with each Grad Mug purchased

Saturday, April 18th
beginning at 8P.M.
\$2.75 each 4 for \$10.00
Presented by Grad Class '83