

nb

today there are letters on don moren's column, the university's trees, john green's statement and clark kerr's firing.

letters

Following Mr. Green's rather crudely worded statement in The Gateway Jan. 27, which does not give evidence of being of the scholarly nature of a man of higher education if one judges by the usage of the type of vernacular, I would like to see Mr. Green comment on the following points.

It is realized by some of us that our directions in life are taken from a religious commitment as adequately expressed by Mr. Fred Cupido in his article in The Gateway on January 20. It appears there that on this basis academic freedom only becomes meaningful as placed in the context of one's religious commitment.

A clear example of this can be found in the General Theory of Evolution and its application of the Transformist Principle to every living creature. The fact that the main bases for this theory are natural selection and mutation is a well-known one. However, less well-known is the fact that these bases are unscientific bases, that is to say, scientifically speaking these bases are open to much criticism and are not verifiable scientifically, while in some cases both these elements seem to cause devolution rather than evolution. Yet, whoever dares to point this out to some biologists, zoologists or anthropologists at our "academically free" university is labelled as unscientific, uneducated, or narrow-minded. In searching for the root of this attitude one comes to the conclusion that it was to a large degree inspired by Darwin and J. Huxley, who were imbued by nineteenth century positivism as a result of the humanist religion.

This theme of the "general theory of evolution" in many of its applications, in particular its application to the origin of man, should be abandoned on scientific grounds and could very well be substituted for by spontaneous generation; yet the suggestion of its partial abolition is not met by a thorough investigation but by a belligerent ignoring.

What I have tried to point out here is the fact that scientific investigations are driven by a ground-motive, or religious commitment if you will, and that the result of investigations, the "scientific" theories, will bear the mark of this commitment.

Thus when Mr. Cupido speaks of

a Free Christian University it makes sense in that such a university is a Christ-centred, not a man-centred community of students and scholars. This university would in the first place state its ground-motive for investigations of scientific nature and continuously test its results by the given criteria of the living Word of God.

According to Mr. Green, academic freedom is one of the virtues of the University of Alberta. Yet, it is well-known that unless one echoes the viewpoints of some professors in examinations or term papers, this applies particularly to the humanities and social sciences, one is very much in danger of failing such, regardless of the knowledge of the subject concerned. This, to me, does not seem much like academic freedom but is indicative of dogmatism.

In conclusion it would seem that a university as suggested by Mr. Cupido would be the best solution to the question of academic freedom and scholarship, since it is driven by a valid motive and is orientated to Jesus Christ, the Root of creation.

d. vanreede
sci 3

There are other causes more deserving of student support. There are other causes more pertinent to U of A's student population than the fate of a dozen or so old elm trees. But, isn't it a shame that yet another of the few beautiful areas on campus is to be mutilated in the name of progress.

Of course, sewers and service tunnels are more important than the shade twelve lonely elms might provide. Especially so when you consider winter session students are absent when these grand old elms are in their glory.

Nevertheless, a group of faculty members are no doubt composing an elegy in the event their appeal to save the elms fails. The Save the Elms Crusade may well mark the turning point in the continuing battle to preserve some semblance of beauty on the Edmonton campus.

The future of the democratic

process in university planning hinges on the success of this Crusade. For if our administrators heed not the advice of those most ably qualified to speak on things aesthetic, what faith can we have in their tolerance and acceptance of criticism on matters so technical as air conditioning in new buildings, the size of undergraduate classes, and the financing of higher education?

No doubt the students' union will issue a formal complaint about not being consulted before the decision to axe the elms was made. After all, we all know how deeply committed to elm trees and things aesthetic our beloved councillors are!

Perhaps the Vietnam Action Committee will call a temporary ceasefire in their anti-American activities (timed to coincide with the Lunar New Year Truce) to demonstrate in front of the administration building about the needless massacre of those friendly old trees.

Refreshing indeed would be the spectacle of bearded aesthetes throwing themselves in front of the power saws in valiant efforts to save the life of the defenseless trees.

The public image of the university has suffered. The "great elm tree scandal" has confirmed the public suspicion that the university is controlled by unthinking, unfeeling, computerized monsters intent on destroying the moral fibre of the province. After all, would you send your daughter to a university managed by elm tree assassins?

The challenge is clear. We must ignore for the moment the myriad other causes that demand action. We must, instead, rally round the elms. Each and every one of us is responsible for the well-being of the threatened elms—indeed, trees of whatever species on this campus. Do you want the destruction of those twelve or so defenseless elms on your conscience?

bill winship
grad studies

For sheer irresponsibility, Don Moren's column (Speaking on Sports, The Gateway, Feb. 3) far exceeded Alex Hardy's story on the



chicken?

intramural hockey incident involving Hart Cantelon.

I was one of those persons Hardy quoted in his story, and my feelings were accurately conveyed.

I was sitting no more than five or six feet from where the incident occurred. Hardy was no more than 10 feet away. What Cantelon said was only typical of a dedicated athlete who feels he has been wrongly penalized and is letting off steam. I have heard worse language at professional sporting events. I'm certain Mr. Brown, the intramural director, has too, in his lengthy association with athletics. I might add that Mr. Brown was not in the arena at the time of the incident, so his statement that Cantelon's language was "filth" is second-hand.

Mr. Brown also states "Alex had assured me he would come and discuss the matter before turning in his story." It is my understanding that Hardy at one time even spoke to Mr. Brown about the incident. Hardy says the only intramural official he saw was Hugh Hoyles. He told Hoyles he would "sleep on the story" for a night, but at no time told anyone he would discuss the matter further.

Even if Cantelon skated at the referee in an attempt to intimidate him (as Moren says apparently happened), that is no excuse for the referee throwing the first punch. It is a sad commentary on our society when officials exercise such total lack of restraint and dignity. How many times during hockey games do we see players charge up to the referee, stand nose to nose, and argue. That is what Cantelon did, and those of us who witnessed it will testify that he did NOT throw the first punch.

Moren also questions the newsworthiness of such a story. To that I will only say that, if an NHL

official slugged a player, it would most certainly be news in the Toronto Globe and Mail. If an intramural official hits a player, it is likewise news in The Gateway, and should be reported.

It has also been suggested that Cantelon had been drinking before the incident. That is nonsense. To my knowledge, he has never touched a drink.

Finally, it was Hardy's right to give his opinion. His was a signed story. Even if it was not, it would not be more offensive than the majority of biased headlines The Gateway tries to pass off as objectivity.

I conclude by saying that both Hardy and myself have one major advantage over Moren and Mr. Brown. We at least were there to see what happened. That, I feel, makes us somewhat more qualified to comment.

bob wanzel
phys ed 3

I would like to correct an error found in the Feb. 8 edition of The Gateway in Mr. Melnychuk's article regarding free tuition.

Governor Reagan of California did not fire Clark Kerr as stated in this article, but, rather Mr. Kerr was fired by the board of regents of the university, as was stated in the Feb. 3 issue of The Gateway. This is an insidious type of error, one which, when slipped in as it was is easily not realized.

A second error was in assuming that Mr. Kerr is respected, but this is of course, a matter of personal opinion.

j. a. grover
grad studies

ELBACHER

