

VIEWPOINT

PAGE FIVE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1964

Student Loans Delay

To The Editor:

The long awaited explanation for this year's delay of student assistance has come, but how feeble! Surely the Student Assistance Board could have anticipated a percentage increase in applicants and had the extra staff on hand. A delay of two weeks may seem a minor point but it really serves to point out a necessary major revision of the awards system.

This year, for the first time, students encountered such bland promises as "Students may borrow up to \$1,000 a year." No further details were explained but naturally many students found it appealing. Hence, many applied. Little did they know that no matter how early they applied they were in for a long three months of university without any of the promised assistance.

In former years the board could uphold its policy on the theory that students should contribute enough towards their own education to carry them over these first months. However this position is no longer tenable.

If a student applies in August or September for a \$1,000 loan and if he is working on a budget of \$1,300-\$1,500 (which many students do) then it must be apparent to the Student Assistance Board that such a student will need part of that loan before the middle of December. Even if a student works on a very stringent budget, he must pay his fees, buy books and pay three months rent before Christmas. This, alone, necessitates more than \$500.

What are students in such predicaments doing this year? By this time the student has had to look elsewhere for assistance, namely his buddies or the bank, where he pays interest. Doesn't this defeat the purpose of the students' assistance program? I would like to know if any steps are being taken to avoid the same situation next year. Could the deadline for applications be put ahead to Sept. 1, for example?

Karen Sorensen
ed 4

Vacuum Of Ignorance?

To The Editor:

To Dr. Lupul I would like to say, "that the falsehoods are truths to others and should be treated as such is conveniently ignored. The main goal is to inoculate the young with their own particular brand of dogma and doctrine..." I would fervently wish that Dr. Lupul would keep this in mind and stop trying to inoculate we young with his own particular brand of dogma and doctrine. (Obviously he believes in his freedom, but not in my freedom).

To Dr. Lupul I would further like to add, "We need people who do not refer to Samoans or to the African pygmies as barbarians or pagan (or to religious colleges as barbarously uneducated)... as long as they maintain the viability of the particular way of life, conscious and deliberate interference with them is the first step in the destruction of that culture—a highly arrogant enterprise, at best." The parenthesis are mine.

I much regret Dr. Lupul's "pat answers to some of life's most difficult questions."

I also regret his very limited choice of one Luthern individual's quotation as the encapsulation of

Christian teaching. I would suggest a wider reading program to Dr. Lupul because "critical enquiry should be genuine and of a depth to disturb..."

Though he has a perfect right under freedom of speech to say what he did to the disparagement of bilingual education, we must remind him that "the jury is still out on whether Canada is unilingual, bilingual, or multilingual..." We must not be narrow and "too ethnocentric" in regard to education. After all, if a person is liberal enough to want to be proficient in two or more languages, and familiar with two or more cultures, this should fall right in with the Majority Report of the Cameron Royal Commission which specified the aims of higher education: "to stimulate initiative, critical thinking and ability to be intellectually self-directing." A broader knowledge will certainly aid an individual to "engage in critical enquiry regarding the beliefs and values which we adults transmit to our children." Dr. Lupul, the "World Needs People Intellectually Flexible."

It seems to disturb Dr. Lupul that "teachers prepared in an outpost of French-Catholic nationalism... will be able to teach in any public school in Alberta." This disturbance of mind is highly peculiar because he later says that students should be exposed to "instructors of deep, personal intellectual commitment," and "Real education, the kind of education required in our time of ideological warfare, only begins when students... are challenged in one class by a devout Christian, in another by an atheist..." etc. Or does free thinking only belong to "nuts"?

It causes Dr. Lupul some concern about the teachings of religious colleges. "These truths may be questioned and discussed; they may even be rejected. But in the view of their sponsors they remain 'truth'..." And what if—just what if, they are truths. (Dr. Lupul has never succeeded in proving otherwise.) Even the skeptic admits one certain truth—"that truth cannot be known." I would like to see any student be "made to 'see'" a religious truth. If we are so gullible to determinism we had better lock ourselves up safely at home or we may believe all the toothpaste ads, and find ourselves laden with 4,000 "best" brands of toothpaste. And we had better, in this light, shut down all the universities too.

How can you say that Christianity is so tied to our way of life when you see African drums and oriental pageantry in the Vatican? Christianity is a way of life—but it can embrace all the cultures of the world. Hence, such statements as "religious colleges have a vested interest in our way of life and find it difficult to challenge it without challenging the basic values and beliefs which have grown up in a Christian context" don't pay any tribute to your doctorate, Doctor.

There are few things as exciting as a confrontation of ideologies. But this presupposes a place a person can freely choose to study an ideology in depth. If a person chooses a religious college he is more to be commended for his honest search than certain doctors who in the name and defence of learning speak out of a vacuum of ignorance about what goes on in such institutions. Such a doctor points to "a feeling of suspicion, even contempt, for the ideas and values of other groups." As time goes on I be-

Are students starving while waiting for government loans? Are you too a disenchanted Journal reader? Are you hopelessly confused? Some Viewpoint writers are.

come convinced that he was looking in the mirror.

Though I find Dr. Lupul's "intellectual climate" to be "stifling," I cannot blame him for refuting 'falsehood' and protecting 'truth' as he sees it. But I think his "concepts must be challenged." Obviously he has pursued "an approach to knowledge wholly contrary to the basis on which truth is determined in every other field of human endeavour." Shall we accept the label of mediocrity from a man who has so mightily shown his own mediocrity?

Oh, we Christian people do not always display the perfection we should. We are people. The way we pass on the teachings of our God by word and deed can often be justly criticized. But a Church is still a Church even if a few donkeys wander in.

'A Friend'

P.S.—I would not like to take credit for all the quotations. They are Doctor Lupul's.

Neanderthal

To The Editor:

Help! I'm hopelessly confused. Being a plodding, dull witted engineer, I simply cannot grasp the Lupul situation. Perhaps some enlightened philosophy major can help me.

It warmed my heart to note that Dr. Lupul agrees with the statement of the Cameron Commission that state supported higher education should "stimulate initiative, critical thinking, and ability to be intellectually self directing." With a sentimental sigh, I read the familiar paragraphs dealing with the idea that 'concepts must be challenged.'

Even an engineer can comprehend this. What confounds me is that an education professor has made this statement. I could only have been more shocked if an engineering prof had said it (or commented on anything). I tried to imagine an education student capable of critical thinking and intellectually self directing, but all I saw was a host of poorly educated people well versed in educational foundations. I tried to imagine an education professor challenging the dogma and doctrine of the faculty of education and I passed out, my feeble brain being overloaded.

I hope this apparent paradox can be explained in the next issue, preferably using diagrams.

Thank you
Neanderthal
eng 4

Better Coverage Wanted

To The Editor:

CUS chairman David Estrin expressed dismay in the Nov. 27 issue of The Gateway concerning the lack of student interest in the South African situation. I derive a sadistic delight in seeing other people run into this sort of problem since I am a member of a political club on campus and deal with the same sort of student apathy concerning political questions of any sort that aren't very contemporary, very controversial and the subject of extensive coverage in the news media.

Probably this whole problem of self-interest versus political obligation has a great deal to do with lack of any sort of distinctive Canadian identity and the recent farce in Ottawa. If the public doesn't demand policy from the political parties, there is little incentive for the political parties to

do the research and study necessary for the presentation of any sort of worthwhile policy statement. Yes, the political parties in Canada and political clubs on campus can be blamed for a certain amount of this failing but the task is immense and discouragement comes easily.

We've scheduled approximately a dozen political speakers in the course of the year and the average student turnout has been around 15. The topics were not world shattering—but not dull either. For example, Grant Notly, Provincial Secretary of the NDP spoke on the question "What is the NDP?" to an audience of 15—from 8,000 plus students on campus! Either everybody knows what the NDP is or few care. I think the latter.

I think one positive step that can be taken in response to this problem is a more extensive effort on the part of the news media to present better coverage of political meetings—no matter how small (since speakers and not audiences make the news).

I might also suggest a permanent column devoted strictly to political affairs on campus in The Gateway. The clubs on campus could make contributions and the column writer could present his news on the merit or demerit of various political speakers on campus.

Wayne Coulter
Campus New Democrats

Knocks Journal

To The Editor:

There was a time when I would read the Edmonton Journal in my free time. However, after reading the story on page 3 of Saturday's paper, "Pourquoi Je Suis Séparatiste," I decided that the Journal should forever more be my Bible. Permit me to elaborate.

The first remark in the story that I would like to comment on is: "He didn't win them to his way of thinking but he did win them with his personality." That Dr. Chaput had a pleasing personality was apparent, I found, to most people in the audience. But, to suggest that our reaction to Dr. Chaput was purely aesthetic is incorrect. Upon leaving MP 126 Friday night, I found his speech very cogent, but then I was listening to what he said; it seems that Mr. Howitt listened to how he said it.

My next contention, minor as it is, comes from the statement that his "rumpled" suit "was covered with chalk from the blackboard for he had accentuated his remarks with writing in chalk." So far as I could see (and I was sitting at the front), there were some chalk marks on the back of his jacket. I also saw him lean back on the rather chalky blackboards. "Rumpled" and "covered with chalk" presents to me the picture of some eccentric in his only suit madly writing on the blackboard, then just as madly erasing with his sleeves, etc. This was definitely not the case with Dr. Chaput.

The most convoluted item in the coverage was: "You are obviously wasting your time and I'm wasting mine," he told one woman who didn't agree with him." Those who attended Dr. Chaput's lecture must agree that this caricature is unforgivable. Eaton Howitt has taken two things out of context and placed them together in his own context, and in such a manner as to make it appear that whenever Dr. Chaput encountered someone who disagreed with him, he could find

nothing better to tell that person than "to go away and stop wasting our time with your foolishness."

The last sentence in the article, "But almost nobody disliked him, try as they might," leads one to wonder just who the hell tried to dislike him.

I have sometimes heard it said that the Journal gets the news by all possible means. You know something—I believe it.

Dave Block
science 1

Revenge Will Come

To The Editor:

How much does a cup of coffee cost? Can you afford a cup each day? Would you suffer should you ever miss your daily cup of coffee?

"The Wall" was an honest attempt to help a good cause and all that was expected of anyone was a contribution equal to the price of a cup of coffee.

You say you have donated already or you refuse to contribute under duress? Then use the sink hole, for you are undoubtedly a senior member of some superior faculty.

Don't forget that everyone paid to go through the hole and that includes the engineers. Thus you may feel a sense of cheap pride in knowing you were one of a minority group. Don't cry out by writing letters to The Gateway for you are only revealing yourself.

As to engineers being beer-drinking slob—fine, leave them be. Just remember who writes about all their aches and petty pains for others to laugh at (and believe me, we laugh).

Remember, life always seems to repay people for things they have done—good or bad. When you knock the engineers, their uncouth tactics of collecting money, their speech and their building—then there is nothing left for them to do but rebel. They will do so during Queen Week and believe me, make good your puny accusations or prepare yourself for stockades and dye for you shall be repaid and then perhaps you will truly have justification for your immature juvenile squawking.

Joe Rapaich
eng 2

Learn Leadership

To The Editor:

Someone just put one of your editorials on my desk. He circled the sentence "What's wrong with the students on this campus?"

Perhaps this analysis is inaccurate, but I get the impression that the thinkers on the campus are all trying to find an answer. Could it be that those who have enthusiasm and leadership ability have been so thoroughly indoctrinated with the "acceptance of the norm" doctrine, that they have no desire to lead or participate. Or is it that they just don't have the courage and determination to fight uphill.

The ability to organize and lead is not God-given, it is gained by learning to follow, and working up. It is one of the greatest assets anyone can develop, and the adverse conditions here on campus will, I believe, hasten the development of those who try. Perhaps the most pressing need on this campus is for people who will come forth to learn leadership on all levels. I know I would like to meet more people who want to try with me.

Yours
Ed Chessor