

Varsity Voices

Apology Demanded

To The Editor:

The Nov. 26 edition of The Gateway carried a news item about the latest postponement of our trial, which contains the following passage: "Mathews, Beissel and Parker-Jervis delivered a petition which attacked the election of Mayor William Hawrelak." I wish to remind you that you are a student editing a paper for students and that it is a tactlessness of the first order to refer to members of the staff that teachers you by their surnames only. It is bad enough having to put up with the ignorance and incompetence of this year's editors of The Gateway (The exception are too few to count); I am unwilling to tolerate your bad manners. It seems to me that an apology is called for.

I would find your faux pas no less objectionable if it did not occur in the same breath in which your favor a man with a title which, as far as I am concerned, he has usurped.

Yours sincerely,
Henry Beissel

Editor's Note: See the editorial "No Apology."

Reply To Frat Girls

To The Editor: (To the Frat Girls)

So "you have the greatest courage"

(when the frat group's at your knee)

"You're the most unapathetic"

Well toss me in the sea.

The only trouble with you is,

You ain't from way down south,

'cause they have your kind of frat there

It's called KKK, big mouth.

—G.

CUCND Defended

To The Editor:

Friday's issue of The Gateway contained a letter from "Cincinnatus," charging the CUCND with advocating policies of appeasement, and endangering the freedom for which the dead of two world wars sacrificed themselves. I wish to point out the complete inaccuracy of his statements.

The basic policy of CUCND urges first, an end to the arms race, and second, the strengthening of the United Nations as the organ of international mediation and co-operation.

THE CUCND DOES NOT ADVOCATE UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT. It DOES advocate the cessation of nuclear testing, the restriction of nuclear weapons to the countries already possessing them, and finally, a negotiated disarmament agreement with provisions for inspection and international control. I fail to see in this policy either a threat to freedom, or anything even remotely resembling the "appeasement" of which Cincinnatus speaks.

The world is presently being maintained by a balance of terror, or as Earl Palmer expressed it, a "pax terrorum." How long can this precarious balance last? Indefinitely? The chances are slim. Until there is, either by accident or by design, a nuclear holocaust? The extinction of the human race is not a pleasant thought. Or until we rid ourselves of the weapons of destruction, and build a world in which men can live in harmony and peace—and freedom? Do we REALLY have a choice?

Anne Nield
Arts 2

Capitalist Replies

To The Editor:

It is not often that I agree with a socialist, but I feel I must take pen in hand to heartily concur with the sentiments expressed by "Socialist" in The Gateway of two weeks ago. I am a firm believer in the free enterprise system by which we (or at least some of us) make a decent living. Hence it is for very different reasons that I too feel that education students are lazy, good-for-nothing, dull, unimaginative, and unproductive drains on our society's energy and wealth.

Who are these education students, anyway? They are in the main recipients of grants, taken from the pockets of the frugal, hard-working, and upstanding citizens of our community. This money is taken from the pillars of our society by a government elected by all, even those who have no money (and hence nothing to lose) at all.

I have looked at the social composition of the education faculty, and have made a startling discovery. It is composed mainly of people whose aspiration is to work for a school board—an instrument of government! These people do not intend to get out on the free labor market, and compete with their fellow man for their daily bread. They are going to become part of the Behemoth that threatens us all, the State.

They are not like the medicine students, nor like the dentists, nor the commerce students. They do not intend, as do these, to go out into life firmly committed to the principles of private enterprise, individual initiative, and balance-book thinking all their lives. They do not intend to stretch to the last dollar, the pocket-book of their clients, who need their services, whether those clients are rich or poor. It is just too bad, these people are undermining Our Way of Life.

There is, of course, one way to solve the education dilemma on this campus, and throughout our fair land. This could be accomplished in two steps: (1) the withdrawal of all grants to slothful education students, and (2) over the next four years, turn over our whole education system to private individual enterprise. In this way we will once again ensure the responsibility of the individual, and a rational economic arrangement.

And what of the child whose parents are too poor to pay for his education? It will develop in him a healthy incentive to get ahead so that his children can go to school.

Yours truly,
CAPITALIST

"In Rome"

To The Editor:

I wish to acknowledge the editor's magnanimous support of "the first freedom" to the extent of even publishing personally derogatory criticism, even criticism seemingly attacking other "freedom" not so widely acknowledged.

Congratulations to Jon Whyte too, for his superb satire on the "Public Morality" of students as well as mayors and police chiefs. Should not the beam be removed from our own eye first? Or shall we follow the Roman example? In Edmonton . . . ?

Doug Hendrickson
P.S. What support have you for the contention that "Nothing could be further from the interests of the U.S.S.R. than the death of Kennedy"?

Spectrum

Fabius Strikes Again

Since the beginning of history every elite that ever held power has thought it had the right to rule. The fraternity power elite on this campus is no exception. In the Tuesday edition of Gateway we are informed by two young ladies that the reason the fraternities hold power on this campus is that they are, among other things, "the only ones with . . . concern and guts," more intelligent than the rest of the campus, and have been groomed for leadership in the past.

Delightful!

Especially so when we notice that the two eloquent and indignant young ladies who inform us of this are themselves fraternity members. One might conclude from this that they fall into the "concerned, intelligent and groomed-for-leadership" class themselves.

In the first place, Fabius is not saying that all fraternity members on Students' Council are bad. He voted for some of them himself.

What he does still maintain is that the overwhelming majority of frat members on council has led to poorer government than might have been reasonably ex-

pected.

The basic mistake that the fraternity apologists make is in assuming that because no one has been able to beat the frat group in student politics means that people support them and are satisfied with what is being done. I think this is untrue.

Much of the structure of student government is such that once in office, the fraternity group finds it fairly easy to continue appointing and electing people from its ranks to positions of power. Whether this is done consciously or accidentally does not affect the fact that it is done.

Did it never occur to fraternity apologists that a major reason non-frat members don't run for student office is that they know they don't stand a hope in hell of licking a highly centralized and well organized campaign run from a house just off campus by a group with a lot of experience in the election business? (And believe me, elections are a business on this campus.)

Interestingly enough, the two ladies in question tacitly admit much of what has been charged

against the frats. Their only reply seems to be that the frats ought to have the power they have now because of some imagined virtue. They admit, for example, that when the powers that be want someone to take on responsibility they turn to the fraternities. That's why frat members are on so many committees. Perhaps if we got a few non-frat men on council we'd get more new faces in other student activities.

My critics suggest that I should be active in reforming Students' Council if I don't like it. Well, I intend to, and so do a lot of other people. I was active in supporting some of the sitting members on council now. If they were running again I would probably still support them. But for the most part, I want a new dynamic council, not just a clique who all belong to the same clubs.

I think a lot of students on this campus agree with me. And I think the sooner we all get together and elect a broadly based student government, the better it will be for the Student Body of the University of Alberta.

FABIUS

Reply To Fabius

To The Editor:

It is intended in this space to take exception to some of the comments made by Fabius which appeared in this column one week ago concerning student government on this campus and the role played by the students in it who are members of fraternities.

Of course the point is well taken that students get the kind of student government that they deserve because everyone has the opportunity to either run for office, or at least exercise his franchise.

Fabius makes two points with which he must be taken to task (a) that student government at this university is dull, unimaginative and sometimes inefficient, and (b) that the sole reason for this alleged condition is the presence of too many fraternity men and women participating in student government.

To begin with, one should never make representations as to fact unless he has specific, positive proof to substantiate his allegations as to what the facts are. It is submitted that the accusation that our student government is unhealthy cannot be based on fact. To objectively evaluate this point, one should compare Alberta's position with other students' unions in Canada and the United States. It is conceded by many universities in North America that students government at the U of A is something of a model union, in that, because of our record in the management of our affairs, a freedom and independence is enjoyed which is almost unheard of elsewhere. The number of large scale projects (SUB expansion is a good example) which are created and administered by students solely for students is unprecedented.

Many students' unions have been gobbled up either by university administration or by professional administrators because of expanding enrollments and activities coupled with the inability of students to manage their own affairs. This is the most dangerous threat to student government today. It is indeed fine to be able to say that this trend has been kept at a minimum at this university. True, ours is perhaps less efficient and slow at times, but this is the price to be paid for the privilege of having the opportunity of making our own mistakes. This it would seem is in full accord with the purpose of student government. The students' union is not a large corporation interested solely in the margin of profit, the students are here to think and to learn and a most necessary aspect of this is the management of public affairs.

While any democratically oriented institution by its nature has many problems to be solved, it is contended by Fabius the mere fact fraternity members play a large part in student activities is the sole reason for the existence of any such ills. Before the same conclusion is drawn by the reader the following points should be considered.

It is straining logic to the nth degree to say that (a) problems exist, (b) fraternities are present, (c) therefore all problems are the result of fraternities. The absurdness of this conclusion is so obvious that further comment is unnecessary.

It is conceded that fraternities are organized and as a consequence this leads to more communication between members. To conclude however that fraternities

lead to an identical way of thinking will not stand up when the question of proof arises. On the other hand, to say membership in a fraternity leads to a broadening of thought and an awareness of events in general can, it is submitted, be illustrated by the fact. Many of our prominent men and women in all fields of endeavor were both active in student affairs and members of fraternities while they were at university. The purpose here is in no way to leave the implication that those who join fraternities are better equipped to lead in later life; the point to be made is that in actual fact those who emerge as leaders in our society are the same people who think fraternities are worthwhile and would all agree benefited by being members of them.

Students should also note that all fraternity people are members of very different social groupings be they academic, religious, political, athletic or what have you. This once more points out the fallacy in the statement that the 1,000 people who compose the fraternities are all the same in their thinking.

As Fabius validly points out a problem at the U of A is a lack of interest in student affairs by a great many of our students. It is to be hoped that more interest will be forthcoming this year. All that is asked here is that it be realized by each student that it is his or her duty to analyze our present setup of student government and to look at each candidate at election time on his individual merits, and not to immediately put him in a pigeon-hole—namely that he is a fraternity member.

Francis Saville
Larry Cunningham