



## From Where I Sit

By BARRY THOMPSON Dean of Students

Now that the very successful Carne '75 is history it appears to be get-serious time again for most students. So as we extend our congratulations to Hugh Whalen and his Carnival Committee I'd like to come out from behind my pile of student interviews, committee meetings on food contracts, student housing, student services building planning-etc., etc. to comment briefly on two topics that concern me: Discrimination and course evaluation.

On DISCRIMINATION.....I'd like to recount one of a number of upsetting stories passed on to me recently to make a point. It concerns a UNB student from Africa who chose to come here because he had heard so much about Canada that he wanted to learn more about us. Soon after classes began he introduced himself and sat down with his tray next to a group of Canadian students in the dining hall in an attempt to get to know them. One by one they excused themselves and moved with their trays to another table leaving him to eat by himself...hurt and lonely.

This and other stories lead me to the conclusion that Canadian students are generally unaware of and unconcerned about the feelings and needs of the foreign student who has a lot to offer but is unsure in a strange culture. In contrast with many European University settings, where foreign students [particularly Canadians] are treated as welcome visitors who can if given the chance contribute to the cultural and academic experiences, a large percentage of students at Canadian universities and at UNB in particular seem to pursue a course of cultural isolation.

Maybe an International Club made up of an equal membership of Canadian and foreign students would be in order.

As a result of the concerns raised in Senate by the Black Student Association last year, a Senate Student Services Sub-Committee on DISCRIMINATION has been established and given the responsibility of evaluating any complaints involving discrimination of an academic, disciplinary or social nature.

The committee is made of three faculty and three students as follows: Prof. Peter Kent, Chairman; Mr. Ken Fuller [Director of Counselling]; Prof. G.B. Thompson [Dean of Students]; Afram Ogbechie; Tim Nicolas; Kathy Westman.

Any individual or student group who has a complaint or a concern related to discrimination is asked to contact any one of the committee members or call or drop in to the Dean of Students office in the STUD.

All complaints will be treated confidentially. Direct action will be taken by the Dean of Students whenever possible.

### ON COURSE EVALUATION.....

Under Michael Mepham's chairmanship, the Senate Course Evaluation committee is conducting the Student Course Opinion Survey during the week of March 17th. The project is well organized and will produce a summary in a student handbook.

This approach is long overdue. In my view, students have the rights to expect course work that is presented in an interesting way, capable lecturing by faculty who have an interest in their object, and faculty members who are available to students for consultation on a regular basis.

Your participation in the Course Opinion Survey will provide you with the opportunity to indirectly tell your professor that a particular course is great, not-so-great, or.....

I fully support the concept of appropriate student representation on Department and Faculty committees on appointments, promotions and tenure as well as a compulsory course evaluation procedure. Honest evaluation from those who really know is important and necessary from where I sit.

## Sale of reactors continued

Continued from page 7  
head home. Surely, they must have had hardened hearts to commit two of the most horrible and hideous crimes of mankind's history.

This is a rather extreme example of the type of alienated orientation which is so prevalent in our society. In the final analysis I believe that the way of thinking illustrated above is different only in a matter of degree from that expressed by such "commercialists" as Mr. MacDonald and company. They simply do not understand and realize emotionally the outcome of their actions. The bombing crew were doing their job. They were only concerned with the efficient handling of their machinery. In the same way those who propose to sell nuclear reactors and technology to foreign governments are concerned only with the financial implications. They are doing their jobs, fulfilling their functional responsibilities which now outweigh any responsibility to humanity.

Once upon a time when men were able to communicate on human grounds, there developed a sense of an inner human community and springing from these deep feelings there arose a definite feeling of responsibility and commitment to the betterment of the human community. This ideal of the community of all mankind has been expressed beautifully in religious terms by Buddha, Lao-tse, Jesus, and Moses, and in humanist terms by Spinoza, Marx and Schweitzer. To all of these men, the primary of the person was the supreme value. This ideal has been betrayed and distorted by every nation ever formed, and I believe this betrayal is no more blatant and revolting than in the case of those nations possessing either nuclear weapons or the means and desires to develop or sell them. We today find Canada in this latter position, ready and willing to negate this ideal.

Mr. MacDonald and his supporters present a disgusting lack of responsibility to and concern for mankind. He remarks that the

issue of nuclear safeguards "is an international problem, not a Canadian one". This amounts to an exclamation of the most profound type of moral nihilism. I sense in his words an indifference to the destructiveness and violence which may result from this government's sale of the nuclear reactors. It were as if by some magic hokus pokus he could absolve Canada from the wrongs done with the technology or machinery she is willing to sell to any nation, no matter how despotic and insensitive to the real needs of its people, if it pays the price. This is the total negation of all humanist values. To be willing to provide the means whereby a nation may become a nuclear threat to the world and then say it is none of our responsibility is absurd. It is insanity.

Mr. MacDonald's remarks bring to mind an incident just prior to the development of the hydrogen bomb. Mr. Lilienthal, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated that "Neither he nor any of his colleagues is opposing any weapon, no matter how terrible, on moral grounds or on principle." This is a shocking statement. To him there existed no conflict between the best interests of humanity and the interests of technical "progress". To the "commercialists" of this present

story, there exists no conflict welfare and preserving human dignity seems to take too long, appears to complex, and requires too much patience and painful rejection of immediate monetary pleasures for such "realists" as Mr. MacDonald and sympathizers. These "realists" display a sad-denying indifference to the justified anxiety of the people of the world.

I am truly amazed that so few voices have been raised concerning an action of such monumental international impact. The very lack of concern and criticism about the course this country is taking indicates the depth of our moral apathy. To most it probably matters little who buys these reactors and technology, which are but a small step from nuclear weapons for a determined nation

One final comment on this situation. Maybe the reason there is so much hurry to complete this perilous transaction, why there is so little concern, so little protest, so little indignation and outcry from the people is that we are indifferent to life. We are not afraid or terrified of helping make the path to total nuclear destruction that much easier to travel because we do not love life.

Michael J. Mayo

## Carni continued

Continued from page 7

table were a few members of the S.R.C. so I knew I was indeed privileged. While we were sitting there a known radical militant approached our table. This is where I address the rest of the letter to Gordon Kennedy. Since I'm especially interested (nosey is more like it) in what he had to say, I listened in (eavesdropped). He told a particular S.R.C. member that this table and another were reserved for W.C.C. members and their dates. The S.R.C. member said Kennedy better check with the W.C.C. chairman, Kennedy was very upset and stomped off.

What really irks me is that not only do the W.C.C. members get in

free (this is fine and I can accept it) but to expect and demand that tables be reserved is utter nonsense. Why should paying customers who have waited in the cold for an hour be denied seats? Naturally no one would have moved anyway even if Kennedy had of cried or screamed for his mother. I heard from a W.C.C. member that Kennedy was unmanageable throughout Carni and used his being on the S.R.C. as a lever. Question: Who the hell is Gordon Kennedy? Answer: B.M.O.C. (Big Mouth On Campus)

D. Chandler  
Arts IV

**PRIME COMMERCIAL SPACE !**

**Direct exposure To Lucrative**

**Student Market !**

**High Traffic Area Of  
Student Union Building.**

**( over 200 square feet )**

**Apply in writing to:**

**Director, Student Union Bldg.,**

**College Hill, Fredericton.**