

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press  
editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing editor ..... Ronald Yakimchuk  
news editor ..... Miriam McClellan  
assistant news editor ..... Glenn Cheriton  
casserole editor ..... Marjorie Bell  
sports editor ..... Bill Kankewitt  
photo editor ..... Chuck Lyall

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—It was a weird press-nite, Marji (Bluebird) Bell and Bill Pasnak were making like the bird part of the birds and bees. Meanwhile the bluebird of happiness was flying high mingling with Ina (pronounced Eena) Van Nieuwerkerk, Dave Blackmore, Ken (the stacker) Bailey, Joe Czajkowski, Dan Jamieson, Cartriona (said Katrina) Sinclair, Elaine Verbicky, Miss Hugo, Judy (she's got a very sexy new sweater) Samoil, Ralf Stengl and the only two professionals on the staff Dan Carroll and Bryan MacDonald. Professional What? Oh yes, yours truly Harvey G. (for gout) Thomgirt, who is not here tonight.

By the way, come see Gateway vs. Pierre LaPuck Friday night at the Bathtub race.  
The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole, advertising—noon Thursday, previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.  
Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1968

## Dr. Johns knows about the average student

The world of student and university politics is, like most things, constantly changing—it makes progress, suffers reverses, switches course and then sits back and examines what has been accomplished or lost.

Unless one is constantly in touch with the people who head and direct the course of the politics, it is all too easy to get lost and become vitally uninformed as to the issues plaguing the student politicians and their constituents — the faithful, never-miss-a-class student.

For a university president to get lost in the shuffle is a cardinal sin. Nevertheless, Walter Johns, president of the University of Alberta has been getting the Bronx jeer from a lot of students and their politicians. Recently the Graduate Students Association decided, en masse, that Walter Johns was "out of touch" with students.

Since Dr. Johns gave them something to thump on—his Memorandum on Student Conduct—the SDU have all but ignored him and this means Dr. Johns is just not in the picture. The SDU only play their game with people who know what is going on in the structure. They don't bother with administrators or students who are not right up to date in their thinking—be it Marxism, capitalism, imperialism or any of the handy dandy political terms so freely tossed around in current day politics.

For all the derogatory remarks about Walter Johns, we have to

assume, because of one of his recent outbursts at the General Faculty Council meeting Monday, that he still knows the basic, average student.

At this meeting and during the debate on the issue of cancellation of classes for the Arts Teach-in held today, Dr. Johns said "cancel classes for the day and students won't bother coming to classes".

While not being a great earth-shattering statement, it shows that Dr. Johns still knows that students come to university for one basic reason—to go to classes, study and get a degree. Take the first piece away and the students surely will not come to the campus.

The intellectuals can say all they wish about democratization, liberalization, etc. etc. of the university. But the vast majority of students here want nothing more than the "education" handed out by the system. All the screaming in the galaxy won't change this.

And Dr. Johns knows it better than all the rest. While the alleged deep thinkers have been concerned about radical change, they have neglected to inform the student that he is part of the change. If he doesn't feel a part of the system, he won't participate which may be exactly what they want.

But while Dr. Johns has been accused of being out of touch with the great revolutionaries, his statement at GFC proves he is in touch with the average Alberta student.

## University and the media

Those who lend a kind ear or eye to the news media these days should be secretly smiling about the fine press coverage given the university these days.

There are stories in the daily newspaper (though mostly with the usual slant), profiles on television (with an unusual but typical television slant towards sensationalism) and the radio.

The best to date has been the radio. They appear to be the most objective of the three.

We can pass the newspaper off as just being generally out to lunch where the university is concerned because they don't know anything

about students—the men who dictate news assignments have never been students here and have never taken the effort to find out what, if anything, is happening.

Meanwhile, the television portrait of Boyd Hall was pure shit. Somehow, we expected more from the Dimension program than a grossly unrepresentative view of a student councillor.

The radio however, especially CFRN, has taken the time to talk to the typical everyday student here. A number of their shorter programs and interviews take a solid look at the campus.

That is what is needed.

## Controversial Dick Gregory provokes our thoughts

The Editor,

With reference to the article in Friday, Nov. 22 issue of The Gateway, I would like to say Sister Judith did not quite get Dick Gregory's message.

Dick Gregory made his position clear by saying he, as an individual, lived for non-violence, but was not prepared to impress his personal approach on others, especially in his society where any agitation of non-violence to a particular group would be a farce and not in keeping with the general atmosphere in that community.

He did not at any time say it was time insult was returned for insult or prejudice for prejudice. Rather, he emphasized that the lower ranks of his society were evermore becoming aware of what insults they have been subjected to and were no longer prepared to swallow this.

Would Sister Judith say such an approval is an agitation for retaliation?

Not being a member of the oppressed, Sister Judith and any of her type cannot fully appreciate the position of these undone people. Dick Gregory, a member of this group, continues unflinchingly to be non-violent. He deserves to be highly commended, rather than be subjected to the sort of mis-

construed accusation he has been subjected to in the article.

I would not like to think that Sister Judith is still of the old group, indoctrinated with catechism which is spelled out without understanding.

Over the ages, the lower ranks of society have obeyed the call of "love for hatred". The outcome has been that of the antagonist solidifying his position more and more. It was time the dogmatic believers realized that the old catechism has long outlived its usefulness. The new meaningful approach would be for the "human rights" workers, including Sister Judith's groups, to concentrate on the antagonists and make them return love for love. I am yet to meet anyone who would justify love to be unilateral, it has got to be reciprocal.

The lower ranks of society have loved all along, but have received oppression and hatred in return. They are now beginning to feel strongly, and justifiably too, that it was time things changed for the good and well-being of all members of the society. This surely is in line with the proclamation of a believer in "human rights".

M. A. Kragha  
grad studies

## Dear Mr. Gregory . . .

Dear Mr. Gregory:

I appreciate the fact that you were able to come to our campus, but your visit left me with many lingering doubts and questions. I think you were able to convey the sense of moral outrage black Americans feel because of the way they have been treated, and I think you personify one of the predictable positions that people emerging from a minority status take. You find America sick and morally corrupt, but you fail to realize that the fact that American people like yourself have come to prominence is a sign of health.

Your position that the all of America's problems are a result of a small group of greed capitalists; "the establishment", (whatever this is) or the CIA reminds me of the simplistic devil theory of the radical right who see communism under every stone.

Your polarization of issues into right against wrong is also symptomatic of this remarkable similarity which you have to the right wing in America, as is your lack of firm belief in constitutionalism. The right wing would like nothing better than to have an excuse to break the law themselves, which they would find if the new left and black radicals began to break the law at will.

I find your condemnation of the hypocrisy of false "Christians", Shriners Clubs and the Wall Street businessmen who ogled Francine understandable, but what about your own hypocrisy in trying to identify yourself with the non-violence of Martin Luther King while at the same time taking as your heroes Rap Brown and Stokeley Carmichael, the apostles of violence? And what are we to think when you say that non-violence is good because it can mobilize the support of young kids to "put capitalists in their right place" (whereas a violent philosophy might cause them to falter due to concern for their relatives).

However, you add that once in action, the kids will probably go ahead and destroy them. How can we take seriously your belief that our salvation lies in trust between people when you want to alienate kids from their parents?

While I can readily sympathize with your concern for the plight of the Indian, and admire your courage in helping American Indians, your position is inconsistent when you advocate liberation and integration of Indians from the reserve, if you believe that the American society is sick. Whether we like it or not, there

are a large number of Indians who want to maintain the reserve system, and not even your attempts to indoctrinate them (dare I use your word "brainwash"?) will not change that. You only injure the cause of the American Indian when you see existing government programs as completely inept. The right wing in America would like nothing better than to think that programs to help the underprivileged are useless, since this provides a perfect excuse to eliminate them.

How can we take seriously your attacks on the American university system for brainwashing students when we realize universities are now centres of dissent in America, and when "academic freedom" has become a sacred phrase in American education? It is easy to use our anxiety about exams to alienate us from the university, but what do you have to offer to replace the fantastic achievements of American education? Even more importantly, what do you have to offer to replace the "system" once it has been destroyed? Will something better emerge automatically?

You have realized that economic security is not enough for individuals, but what values do you have to offer us to provide a firm guide for personal behavior as well as a social order when you mock Christian ethnics, and when cynicism has replaced the humanism in your thoughts?

Racial prejudice is a sign of sickness in American society, but the fact that it is being overcome is a sign of the vitality of American life. I can only hope that you can realize this before you and the people you inspire destroy the system which gives you enough freedom to advocate its destruction. If you want to help America, work to reform it and with your fantastic wit continue to make the government officials realize the importance of equalizing opportunity.

You provoked many of us who heard you to laughter, but I left with the feeling that few realized the total impact of what you were advocating. I can understand how the anxiety and frustration which we are all faced with can cause us to look for a scapegoat to project our problems onto, but we surely have progressed enough to realize that blanket condemnations and simplistic solutions (if anarchy can be called a solution) cannot bring a better world.

Howard Palmer  
grad student  
681391