

abortion / murder

It seems unfortunate that women's Lib and the Abortion question surfaced at the same time. Because of the apparent connection between the two questions, it is difficult to be anti-abortion without also sounding anti-Women's Lib. There is a difference, however.

The case for Women's Lib requires no argument. Both women and men have been stereotyped into roles which essentially make them unhappy. Women have gotten the worse end of it, and have had their individual development stunted throughout the history of the human race. In regards to male-female stereotypes, it is definitely time for a change.

Abortion is a slightly different question, though. The essential question has been clouded by propaganda for and against. Pro-abortion propaganda has depended on its link with Women's Lib, while anti-abortion propaganda seems designed to make the public barf, with its pictures of aborted foeti. All this has tended to cloud the issue, which is essentially that: is the human foetus human? If it is (or when it is) to have an abortion is to commit murder. Here are the facts (as we know them): (1) geneticists and foetologists consider the embryo as an independent human being at the moment of conception; (2) psychologists consider elementary learning to begin before the fourth month; (3) a child is capable of surviving outside the womb well before the sixth month. I don't know if any of this really has anything to do with the essential humanity of a foetus, but at least it illustrates the possibility that a foetus is a living human being. We have no doubts concerning the extinguishing of the life of a new-born child: it is murder. If, and I repeat, if a foetus is human, then to have an abortion is to commit murder.

I'm sorry that only females get pregnant and have to carry the child for nine months. I'm also glad that it's not me. In these regards, nature appears very unjust. But that's the way things are. I'm also sorry that only women have to put up with monthly periods. But that's also the way things are—purely the luck of the draw. But I don't think either pregnancy or periods are sufficient excuse for risking the possibility of committing murder. All I can do is suggest that all women go on the pill. But if a woman gets pregnant, well, that's life—in more ways than one.

I'd like to remind women of one more thing: something which might affect their happiness directly. You may have (or have had) an abortion someday. You'll then slowly accumulate guilt every time you see a baby. Especially if you later have one you keep. You'll begin to wonder what it was you threw away. I won't envy you.

Joe Woodlard
Arts 2

foreigners

I cringe at the thought of writing a reply to a reply to an article written by someone I don't know, especially when the other reply was written by a grad student in economics. The relevance of the whole endeavor could be hard to defend. However, chin up and jump in.

Ken Smith, in the January 23rd edition of *The Gateway*, hit a nerve. My adrenalin rushes and my hair stands on end when I hear mention of foreign investment. Nothing personal, I just live here. I don't wish to debate Mr. Smith's whole position, which is in general firmly grounded. It is merely a few statements which raised my eyebrows. First of all, I agree with Mr. Smith in that investment companies, public utilities, and the retail trade on the one hand and the petroleum industry on the other are not comparable references. Public utilities are not profitable; petroleum is. That's why we own our utilities and the U.S. owns our petroleum refining industry. This is the point of Mr. Moore in the original article, "Does it Really Matter What Happens Down on the Farm?" Canada has always slyly conned someone else into doing the dirty work of profit-making for us.

I also agree that statistics, second-hand, are unreliable. You can bend, twist and otherwise mutilate figures to fit your personal connotations. This could be the cause of Mr. Smith's disputation of some of Mr. Moore's figures. Mr. Moore was likely thinking of the manufacturing, or refining sector of the petroleum industry as representing the whole industry (as in commonly done) when he notes that it is 99% in foreign hands. Mr. Smith may have included other factors in his consideration. Assuming this to be the case, *The Grey Report* does disagree with Mr. Moore's figure. Their figure? 99.7%.

One question which I urge you to reconsider, Ken, is that of "who can possibly own Canada except Canadians?" You've heard of renting? We're already paying quite a fee to have Americans take some of our business affairs off our hands. Let's face it; anyone can own Canada if they have enough money. And the U.S. does. I mean, who's going to stop them?

Bill Schloegl
Arts 2

student, as an option in lieu of the Athletic Board fee of \$10.00 should make the operation of the gallery independent of mercenary ventures. It could then once again redress the imbalance of an insensitive visual environment, give attention to artistic endeavours whether by established artists, artists in the making, experimental or controversial artists, as long as they seek after truth and have personal integrity.

Art students themselves, that much maligned minority, with a very uncertain future even if they complete their studies with honor, suffer most damage if the Student Union Gallery ceases to function as a gallery, if it is closed to them because they cannot afford to pay a fee of \$30.00 per day for a facility they have paid for once already with their Student Union fees.

It is the Art and Design students whose prospects in the future would be jeopardised if the name of the University of Alberta Student Union Gallery would be associated, by the artist — and University communities throughout Canada, with exhibitions of a type commonly found in shopping malls.

That is why, Student Union policy notwithstanding, as a teacher of art and design I feel duty bound to try and prevent crude commercialism from driving out art.

Walter Jungkind
Professor
Department of Art and Design

form an action against his
to expropriate the values he
owned (property), is grossly
Libertarians affirm the
of human life, and for
selfish reasons. We affirm
of the individual to
and defend his life, his
against those who would
appropriate them through the
of the use of force;
further: that a person thus
has the right to exact
from the aggressor
to all the costs of that
action. We affirm *only* the
to the retaliatory use of
retaliation which must be
under an objectively
set of guidelines called
"law". These laws must be
enforced by impartial judges
within precisely
boundaries. And the
of contractual
relationships demand that they
rely
able and known to all.

Mr. Neumann, the state
know what's best for me,
anybody; they can't see
my soul. They can only
wild stabs in the dark, and,
ic, ally enough, these stabs
rise injure the very people
were intended to help. In
context a society based on
principle of voluntary
age doesn't really sound so
how does it?

Brent Bissell
Commerce

um five

FOREIGN
OWNERSHIP!
we've got it all...

rtunked

nt U titled to assume that the
allery would still adhere to at
most similar principles.

To have abandoned all
istic standards and to have
he dily embraced the profit motive
as of sole criterion for any University
g to cility, whether student
feerated or not, seems
it ouestionable and retrograde even
own the worst of times.

To do so after several years
owless investment in expertise, care
3 galld last but not least,
istribnsiderable expenditure of
theoney, appears irresponsible. To
ander, for a few hundred
as ellars, a reputation that would
ec.Pres several years longer to
generould than it took to establish,
a drams ludicrous.

If the Student Union
hen eutive persists, as is their
irt gal right (unfortunately) to
full tem the SUB gallery into an
stic usement Arcade or Shoppers'
ed gal, the general public and
le Mpecially the artistic and
iversity communities not just
y Gal Alberta, but throughout
berta, ada, should be made aware
the this by a change of name of
wneformer art gallery.

I suggest that it might be
ot m named "Students' Union
a tashu Mart" in keeping with
hibitns envisaged function.

The last facet of this sad
xhibitsness is that a group of
ationsents, admittedly a minority,
getting a very raw deal from
Students' Union.

The Art students are, at
esent, compelled to pay
0.00 SU fee, which previously
ered the Art gallery.
Five dollars per year per

counter point classroom democracy

The proposal for classroom democracy, or student power in the classroom is an old tune that is once again being heard on this campus (see the Jan. 25 Gateway for example). The professor, in such a proposal, is seen as a resource person and guide rather than as, is presently the case, an omnipotent instigator and overseer of all classroom and course-related activity. The advocates of classroom democracy attack the present system of marks, examinations, and assignments on the grounds that they foster a competitive and at the same time subversive attitude in students, an attitude which greatly interferes with one's development of individuality in mental and academic aspects. In other words, obedience makes a student mentally slavish, doctrinaire and cowed. It interferes with the process of education itself and precludes much of the personal satisfaction that study can produce.

This proposal for classroom democracy is laudable, and the innocence with which it is usually encouraged is somehow refreshing, but the proposal is all too often naively put forth. There are tremendous problems with such a scheme, and the corollaries of this viewpoint are far-reaching and perhaps revolutionary.

For one thing, the competitiveness of the university system only mirrors the competitiveness of the outside world. You can't abolish the former without abolishing the latter. The university is accountable to society (financially and perhaps ethically) for the production of highly trained persons. The university dictates course content because society requires certain training; the university emphasizes grades because employers emphasize standards, degrees and grades, credentials of one's qualifications. And the university coerces students with marks because society coerces the university and its graduates with money. If the classroom is competitive, it is because our society is competitive. If the university forces assignments and examinations upon students it is because society forces lifestyles on citizens. If the classroom deals in the currency of marks it is because society deals in the currency of money. The day that the pass-fail system is accepted on this campus will be the day after they start burning money at the Toronto Stock exchange.

The more naive of the classroom democracy advocates are perplexed and anguished by an apparent paradox of the university. This paradox is that the university, while ostensibly an institution dedicated to the free pursuit of knowledge, nevertheless persists in employing methods, such as lecture-type teaching, examinations, and autocratic rule, that interfere with the process of free learning. The resolution of the paradox is that the university is, in fact, not primarily a place to learn freely. It is, before anything else it might be, a factory, a highly specialized segment of civilization engaged in the manufacture of a highly specialized commodity required by modern, technological, fragmented society. Examinations and assignments are but the means of enforcing quality control on the product, grades and degrees but the method of sorting the product as to quality.

Another problem with the classroom democracy proposal is that the great majority of students, I am willing to bet, do not want it. They are content with the status quo of society and of the university. (How else do you explain the appalling apathy of students toward their political milieu?) They are satisfied that the professor knows better than they do what course content should be. They require marks, examinations, and assignments to coerce them into learning. They want the degree that certifies their intelligence because they themselves doubt their intelligence and because they want the certification necessary for their absorption into the various roles of society.

Classroom democracy, or an equivalent alternative, is desperately needed however for some students, or for some of the students some of the time. The present quandary I think stems from the fact that the university tries to fulfill simultaneously the function of a training ground for society and of an institution dedicated to the free pursuit of learning. It is because of this wedding of incompatible mates that the university so often appears hypocritical. (The dean says "Quicumque Vera" in one breath and in the next "You are here to get an education, get a degree, and get out.") Classroom democracy belongs to and is necessary in a free-learning atmosphere but not in a training-ground situation.

So I say to the exponents of classroom democracy, find a free university (like F.U.N.), find a liberal arts college, or if you will, attack this university for its policies, but recognize that when you attack the university, you attack society as well. Recognize that your indictments of this university are ultimately indictments of society. And realize that the university won't change substantially until society does.

Arthur Savage

Letters to the Gateway on any topic are welcome, but they must be signed. Pseudonyms may be used for good cause. Keep letters short (about 200 words) unless you wish to make a complex argument. Letters should not exceed 800 words.

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students of the University of Alberta. Contents are the responsibility of the editor. Opinions are those of the person who expressed them.

Staff this issue: Belinda Bickford; Allyn Cadogan; Joyce Clarke; Linda Fair; Bart Hall-Beyer; deena hunter, arts; Terri Jackson, editor; Peter Johnston, photos; Sylvia Joly, typesetter; Harold Kuckertz, Jr.; Victor Leginsky; Loreen Lennon, arts assistant; George Mantor; Susan McMaster; Colleen Milne, headliner; Art Newman; Walter Plinge; Murray Polushin; John Prat; Elmer Pruss; Jerry Rattray; Michel Ricciardi, photos; Sylvia Ridgley; David Ross; Larry Saidman; Arthur Savage; Candace Savage, News; Polly Steele; ron treiber, production; Brian Tucker, sports; Lawrence Wilkie; Joan Williams; Lisa Wilson.

gateway