

NEWS

Deadline: Wednesday at 12:00 noon. News Desk: 453-4983

Aquinian advertisement causes concern

by Karen Burgess

Letters to the editors of both *The Aquinian* and *The Brunswickan* continue to be sent in by students concerned over the publication of an ad in *The Aquinian*.

The advertisement in question had the words "one hot p---y" across the top and an arrow pointing to a cartoon cat, *The Aquinian* logo.

Concerns were voiced by several staff members over the ad, and at least one is considering taking formal action, in conjunction with STU's sexual harassment officers, over resulting actions and discussions carried on at *The Aquinian* office.

Kelly MacGowan, a news writer at *The Aquinian* says "sexual harassment goes beyond this ad," and says she has been subject to "not just sexual harassment but harassment" from other staff members.

Allyson Vaughan, News Editor at *The Aquinian*, has raised concerns about the ad and *The Aquinian*'s subsequent apology, which she feels is "not really an apology".

Vaughan says she hesitated to take formal action through the University sexual harassment policy, hoping to resolve the issue with other methods. She says "it doesn't make a place comfortable to work at," and continues "...the issue really comes down to 'it [the ad] was sexist'."

Mike Fralic, Entertainment Editor for *The Aquinian* says he believes that the ad illustrated "sexism, sure—but sexual harassment, no." He further comments that in his opinion the issue has been "overblown."

Dale Geddes, Editor-in-Chief of the paper, says that *The Aquinian* has no policy to deal with making judgments on what material is admissible or inadmissible with regards to possible sexist content. He says that he plans to bring this up at the next Board of Directors' meeting, in mid November, and to work toward the completion of the policy during the Christmas break.

When asked if he felt the ad was sexist, he replied "my opinion doesn't mean squat—it's what the students think."

Geddes was then questioned as to whether or not he believed the responses to the ad received in various Letters to the Editor was sufficient to gauge students' attitudes regarding its possible classification as sexist.

He replied that he has received as many letters from people who believe the issue to be "a waste of time."

Vaughan says that comments were made, in her absence, at the editorial board meeting alleging that she "obviously has a dirty mind if she's thinking of the double entendre (present in the word 'p---y')."

MacGowan, who was taking the minutes of the meeting, confirms that comments to this end were made.

Geddes denies saying that anyone had a "dirty mind" but that "if people are getting the double entendre, that had to come out of their heads."

The Editorial Board held an emergency meeting before the last Board of Directors meeting to discuss the issue. Two votes were held at this meeting. The first vote asked editors to judge whether they believed the ad to be sexist: three voted "yes", five voted "no". The second vote was to determine if it was felt that there was sexual harassment present in the printing of the ad: two editors voted "yes" and six voted "no".

The Board of Directors then voted on the same questions. The results were that two board members believed the ad was sexist, two believed it was not, and one member abstained from voting. None of the board members believed there was harassment present (there was one member who abstained from voting on this question as well).

MacGowan says "The Editorial Board and the Board of Directors voted down that it was sexist after talking to Dale and having him explain 'no, its not sexual harassment' and saying that any sexism taken from it was the fault of the people's own

dirty minds for getting the double entendre."

Vaughan says that "Obviously (Geddes) doesn't know what sexism is or what constitutes something that is sexist and that's the whole problem. I find it hard to work in an environment where people think something's funny when the fact is that it offends people who work in the same place."

Vaughan says she wants

people to know that things are getting "progressively worse" at *The Aquinian*. She says she has "tried to talk to the people there and say 'look this kind of behaviour can't be tolerated' and the response that I've received has been negative. I don't think the issue has been addressed properly."

Vaughan says she fears people will not want to work for the paper because of this issue, and

says "*The Aquinian* has got to realize its got to more inclusive because I feel like there's been a real backlash."

Geddes acknowledges that there may be a backlash as "there are a lot of people who feel resentment" over the charges of sexism.

He feels however, that the real concern is not what was printed but what will be done about it.

Discrimination case revisited

Dr. Coleman speaks about his report and the Brunswickan's article

by Karen Burgess

Dr. Dan Coleman, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Administration, has expressed several concerns over *The Brunswickan*'s treatment of a case of alleged discrimination in the Faculty of Administration.

The article, which appeared in the September 25 issue of *The Brunswickan*, did not contain Coleman's statement regarding the student's allegations as, at the time, Coleman had been advised not to discuss the issue and therefore would not comment to *The Brunswickan*.

The information in the article was excerpted from a copy of the report Coleman wrote compiling the findings of his investigation into the issue. Coleman feels there are three major flaws contained in the article, which he considers to be a "skewed presentation of the facts."

First, the article stated that "Every international student in the class was originally a signator to the complaint..." Coleman states that one of the international students in the class did not sign the complaint though the student's name was typed at the bottom of the document. There is discrepancy as to the student's level of involvement in the complaint. Coleman says "There is a difference in the story on the origin of the complaint as well. (One of the complainants) said that (the student in question) typed it, (the student in question) said that (he/she) did not type it, that (the other student) typed it. As so (the student in question) says now 'I never intended to have my name appear on this thing.'"

Coleman also objected to the treatment of an incident where the professor in question told two of the students they should "Kiss your God if you get C in this course." Coleman wished to have the entire section of his report which dealt with the comment printed, as he feels the comment was presented out of context and felt the conclusion quoted in the article was inaccurate.

(c) Offensive Comments. A last issue regarding attitude outside of class is the statement alleged to have been made by (the accused professor) to two of the complainant students (names followed here in the report) that they should "kiss your God if

you get C in this course" (see section b. of Appendix A, p.2).

(The accused professor) has repeatedly denied making this statement. However, (two international students and one Canadian student) all witnessed the incident, and all recall (the accused professor) having made the comment. It is clear from discussions that (the international students) were severely offended by the remark. I asked (the Canadian student who witnessed the remark) what he thought (the accused professor) meant, to which (Canadian student) replied "you'll be lucky." I asked (the Canadian student) if he thought that (the professor's) comment was offensive, to which he replied "no". I also asked (the Canadian student) if he thought that (the professor) had offended the students, or if he thought that (the professor) had intended to offend the students, and (the Canadian student) replied "no" again.

Later, (another professor) an expatriate of the same country, as is the accused professor) explained to me in a private conversation that the phrase "Kiss your God" is an English translation of a (their home country's language) slang phrase which means "you will be lucky."

At the joint meeting with the students, (the accused professor) stated that although he still denied making that specific comment, that he regretted if anything that he said offended the student, and any offense was unintentional.

Whether his denial of making the statement is because he actually did forget, or because he is an extremely defensive posture where he will not admit to anything that even remotely shows prejudice on his part will probably remain unknown. However, if (the accused professor) did actually forget making this statement, this suggests that he did not attach much importance to making it, thereby supporting (the other professor's) and (the Canadian student's) interpretation of the remark.

Summary and Opinion. I have no doubt that the complainant student were offended. I have very little doubt that (the accused professor) actually made the statement.

Still, I believe that (the ac-

cused professor) did not intend to offend the students, and I hope that his public expression of regret is accepted by the students.

Again, I feel compelled to add some personal observations. I feel that (the accused professor's) comment was injudicious. Regardless of whether he intended to offend or not, he should not have made a comment such as that to any student. There are many devout students of various religions at UNB. References to "your God" would offend many of them. Still, I accept (the accused professor's) contention that he did not mean to offend, but strongly advise him to choose his comments more thoughtfully in the future."

This issue, Coleman says, is the one which has caused him "the most personal grief because (letters and opinions received in response to the article) saying that I overtly endorse the use of racist or discriminatory language is not at all what I said."

"My commentary about that aspect of (the professor's) performance was the strongest condemnation of anything that he had done."

Coleman's third concern over the article was what he considered the most severe error.

The article stated:

"The Acting Dean's report quotes a Canadian student in the class as saying that it was the professors normal practice 'to repeatedly question students who were not fully prepared for class, and that, in the incident in question, it was painfully obvious to all that one of the students who felt that he was bullied had not read the material.'"

This was a typographical error which seemed to imply Coleman's authorship of the whole quotation, when in fact, only excerpts of the passage were from Coleman's report.

The article should have read: "The acting dean's report quotes a Canadian student in the class as saying that it was the professor's 'normal practice' to repeatedly question students who were not fully prepared for class, and that, in the incident in question it was 'painfully obvious to all' that the student who felt he was bullied 'had not read the material.'"

Coleman says, "The whole question of bullying is almost

continued on page 8

Grad Class '93 to hold re-vote

by Kayleigh Freeman

The Grad Class held their first meeting on Sunday night and had a turnout of over 200 people.

At this meeting they discussed a date for the Prom, which will be held on May 26, and the Grad Class' first social which will be held on Friday, at 2:30 at the Social Club.

As well, vote was held to determine what the class of '93's project would be. On the ballots were three projects that had been researched and proposed by the executive: donations to the Library Fund, a "Brick and Mortar" project and donations to the SUB expansion fund.

At the meeting, it was

proposed that the grads consider voting for the construction of a playground for the proposed on-campus daycare.

The vote resulted in a small lead for the daycare project, which was followed closely by a Brick and Mortar project, and the Library Fund.

However, Mary Dable, president of the Grad Class says that upon looking into the playground project new information came to light that she feels might have effected the vote's outcome.

As a result, a new vote will be held after publication of detailed descriptions of each project in next weeks *Brunswickan*