

Psychology students set the record straight?

Dear Sir:

Concerning the article which appeared in The Brunswickan last week I would like to make a few comments.

I do not agree with the article entirely, especially the statement that "the faculty of the psychology department are fighting with each other to such a degree that something as simple as the faculty-student lounge has had difficulty in becoming a reality." Although I have not conversed with multitudes of students concerning their reactions to the article, I do believe according to my own interest in the matter and in judging by the reactions of the numerous psych. majors with whom I have spoken, that the above statement is not true at all... the professors are not fighting amongst themselves any more than faculty members in any other department.

However, concerning the lounge and one other matter I would like to present a slightly different story based upon my own biased opinion and the majority of people with whom I've spoken.

The furniture for the lounge arrived in June. It was ordered by one professor who volunteered her time and effort to do so. As a consequence no one should have cause to differ with obvious honest intentions of the faculty in the attempts to formulate a lounge for everyone's use. The problem as it exists however centers around the neglect of an absolute minority of faculty members in executing the obvious obligation of communicating to the undergraduate students (reps or otherwise) the means by which they had proceeded to deal with the construction of the lounge.

The students, since they arrived in September, naturally took an interest in the matter of the lounge and they have in good faith made it known that they would like to help

in its implementation. No matter how sloppy was their approach to the matter it was an honest attempt on their behalf to work with the faculty and grads and not against them.

Furthermore, it seems that one or two faculty members persist in maintaining a tendency to act and react to students in condescending attitudes. Eventually such attitudes can no longer be accepted by students and they must, if necessary make it known by the press or otherwise that such attitudes should not continue indefinitely. There reaches a point that those persons involved should realize the existence of some basic facts students (as professors) are merely human beings who act according to emotions, feelings, desires - they are not rational, logical machines all day, every day of the school year. No matter who the individual, if he believes in something and is at the same time led on by excuses or pushed too far by the power structure - he should stand up for his rights. Furthermore most external observers would undoubtedly applaud his standing on his own two feet whether he wins or loses, as opposed to resorting to heavy-handed, behind the scenes backstabbing.

Myself, I have been involved in what can be called nothing other than a personality clash with one particular faculty member. I regret that to this date there has been no acceptable means to rectify such personal differences of opinion in private, yet with the future rests hope. In any event I certainly do not wish that personal differences should interfere with the execution of departmental affairs whose eventual outcome is ideally for the benefit of the entire department. In contrast, I think it has been the intention of numerous individuals including faculty, grads and majors to eventually create a more cohesive atmosphere amongst all those concerned - both academically and socially.

In the future I do not hope to witness or participate in such differences as those which have occurred these past few weeks. This however is obviously not for me to decide.

I trust my view as presented

here bears the witness and consent of those psych majors who have been involved in this matter. At least I believe without a doubt that it there are any majors who might wish to disagree with what I have said - they will probably let me know about it and at the same time

make the attempt to empathize before they criticize.

David N. McMillan
(4th year psychology undergraduate representative.)
Stuart Neilson
3rd year representative.



Photo by Ron Ward

The Inter Varsity Christian Fellowship has a Drop-In time at the CAMR Training Center on Tuesday evenings. Why not 'drop-in' and help the mentally handicapped?

IVCF aid mentally handicapped

Dear Sir:

Look around you! How many of the people you see, have a relative or member of the family with a mental handicap? How much do you know about this aspect of our

society?

Three per cent of Canada's population are mentally retarded and in Fredericton alone we have 130 mentally retarded people attending a special school or training center.

Did you know that CAMR (Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded) has a Training Center along side of Zellers on King Street in an old remodeled fire station? Teen age and young adult age retardates work there making beautiful pieces of handicraft. Why don't YOU drop by and see what they're doing?

Tuesdays from 7 - 10 p.m., there is a Drop-In time at the CAMR Training Center where everyone is welcome. Dancing, singing, entertainment and food will greet you if you drop in.

Inter Varsity Christian Fellowship will probe into the mentally retarded situation and see what's being done and what can be done by students. Come and see what we've found out - Friday, Nov. 23, 8:00 p.m., Room 26 in the SUB. Attending will be people who KNOW and can ANSWER questions.

The following week, Nov. 30, IVCF will be sponsoring a party for the CAMR kids. It will be held from 7 - 10 p.m. at the CAMR Training Center. If you'd like to join us, you're very welcome to meet at Room 26 in the SUB at 6:50 where transportation will be provided or just drop in at the Training Center any time during the evening. Be looking forward to seeing you Nov. 23 and Nov. 30.

Cathy Carter
I.V.C.F.

Brunswick movie reviewer gets criticized

Dear Sir:

I have reached the end of my endurance concerning Danielle Thibeault's reviews. Honestly, does she not watch or at least absorb what she attends?

Earlier this year she reported on "Young Winston". I really didn't believe she could be so ignorant as to equate syphilis with a rare disease. The producers, anticipating a lack of knowledge about the Churchills, went out of their way to include a scene wherein the Doctors are relieved to discover that Jennie will not also be heir to the disease because she had not had recent intercourse with her husband. Also, Miss Thibeault chose to mention the section dealing with Winston's first book and then proceeded to get the title wrong. If it was worthy enough to mention it was worthy enough to get right.

Another of her massacres was the mime artist Pepusch, whom she had the gall to congratulate

when it is quite apparant from her review that she did not even stay to see the whole performance. Miss Thibeault says, to quote, "A truly enjoyable, though short performance." I don't know when she left, but it was four o'clock when the performance was over, and 1:45 - 4 does not equal short. None of the mimes in the second act, such as, the excellent "Violin, slightly disturbing" were so much as mentioned. Perhaps Miss Thibeault should look up the word "interval" in the dictionary. At no time did Pepusch portray - a writing desk, a sadistic executioner or a vegetable garden. He did, however, portray Adolf Eichmann at his writing desk, on the battlefield and in his garden. But I imagine Miss Thibeault has never heard of Eichmann (or Hitler for that matter) since she apparently feels youth does not have any time for anyone of that era.

Her review of "Save the Tiger" (in a prior issue to "Young Winston") was nothing but a tirade against a generation of "Harry's" who it appears she has neither the

time or the intelligence to understand.

Maybe if she goes to class she'll learn about Hitler and Eichmann and will not be so quick to dismiss the "Harry's" of this world. For if my four years at university taught me nothing else they have taught me that while Harry's motivations might not agree with mine they are not just cause to write off Harry. Harry has a right to understanding too.

And last but not least there is the latest so-called review of "Last Tango in Paris." I am entirely without words to describe it but Miss Thibeault has saved me the bother. It shows "the intellect of a decapitated cuckoo bird".

Miss Thibeault's reviews are working their way from stupidity to mediocrity but at an extremely slow rate. Since she is listed as Photo Editor perhaps she should stick to pictures, after all they are worth a thousand words.

Karen Crandall

Dear Sir:

I have watched in morbid fascination as your movie critic, Danielle Thibeault, has moved her insidious way from one disastrous review to another. She has, however, reached her depth of incoherent ignorance with her butchery of Last Tango in Paris.

Her immaturity has been proven by her non-review of Save The Tiger (a childish diatribe about her wishy-washy "hip" ideas of valiant youth against corrupt old age), and her uninformed thoughts on Young Winston (has she never heard of Winston Churchill?) But now she has turned her none too accurate attention to Last Tango, and surpassed herself in a mindless ado signifying nothing.

I thought the time had passed when someone would actually be afraid to write 'fuck' in a college newspaper (even our national magazines have passed this barrier), but your fearful reviewer has a massive F followed by three

Continued on page 9