



DISCRIMINATION, FREE YOUNG CANADIANS, EDITOR AND EVEN BLITZ BLITZED

NO BULLY-CLUBS

To the Editor:
I'm in sympathy with the courageous man who honestly answers the statistical head-hunters with "I would rather not have a Negro live in my home." I'm in sympathy with him because I object to the inhumanity of waving the bully-club of shame over the heads of timid, self-purjuring souls.
And even if all those surveyed were courageous enough to resent the Gateway's breach of human privacy, we would not be better informed by being shown statistically that all Edmontonians have prejudices. At best, this would only prove us human (we've had a suspicion of this and much evidence in The Journal).
Society transmits prejudice, even to Negroes, before there is an awareness of its nature. Therefore, I object to a treatment of "race" prejudice (a presently famous member of a large family), that makes the prejudiced entirely guilty to treatment of this subject as an easy, eye-catching issue to be dealt with in the sensational manner of Expose et al.
Dr. Johns may have diverted the Edmonton council from making Calgary's type of international blunder, by his politically wise diplomacy, but since this moral fervour has been re-directed towards the Canadian native problem, there ought to be a cautious examination of the foundation from which the council would rear its humanitarian structure.
My experience with Eskimos and Indians has convinced me of their very normal sense of dignity and privacy. I'm persuaded by a successful Indian student that undue publicity under the title of race prejudice is just what he neither wants nor needs. Like every self-respecting person, he wants to win an acceptance, among his associates, of his physical and mental peculiari-

ties (if we can so designate what distinguishes one from another or two men from their brother) by labour that takes time and personal effort.

The very nature of prejudice, racial, religious, or any other, ought to teach us that fear and ignorance are not legislated out of existence nor threatened out of human hearts by the censure of public or press.

Kelvin T. Johnson

Ed. Note: No, not legislated out, nor threatened out but, we hope, persuaded out.

NO POLITICAL BIGOTRY

To The Editor:
I have been pleased to note that in recent issues of The Gateway, extreme distaste has been expressed by some of the students of this university in regards to the matter of racial bigotry.

While considerable space has been (commendably) devoted to this bigotry, another of equal importance (and which is also present—in rudimentary form—at this university) has escaped almost unnoticed. I speak here of political bigotry.

This is embodied and expressed in the recently organized "Canadian Youth for Freedom" group; which, has been preaching its false gospels of intolerance, misrepresentation, and prejudice among the students of the University of Alberta under the guise of Christianity.

As equally deplorable as racial bigotry, the baseless "Red-baiting" which the group has been indulging in, is also as potentially dangerous to the good order of this institution.

While history has shown that initial criticism given to small and radical groups has only brought them the attention which they required in order to grow, I hope that criticism applied in this case may

service, instead, to cancel the idealization which some people have for John J. Barr and dogma.

Some students have developed this idealization because they admire Mr. Barr's "guts" in standing up for what he believes in. This is very nice; but please remember that what he believes in, essentially, is the suppression of another group's rights to utilize their "guts" in standing up for what they believe.

Certainly what the "Canadian Youth for Freedom" group esteems politically is not an admirable target for idealization—unless the idea that any man, woman, or child who thinks there may be some good to Medicare, the Commonwealth, disarmament, or peaceful co-existence with our fellow man should be branded a communist and eliminated is, in your estimation, an admirable ideal.

Let me say to anyone who is truly concerned about the communist menace to his country, that to resort to methods as radical and violent as those of the communists themselves will, in no way, bring benefit to Canada. "He who fears, loses his strength in the battle against evil" could not be quoted in a more significant context, as the YCF is exhibiting plain hysteria.

When Mr. Barr resorts to his frequent and disparaging "Red-baiting" I submit that he unequivocally defeats himself by the religion from which he professes to derive fervour—in its admonition to "judge not lest ye be judged." Actually, Mr. Barr, everyone whom you dislike is not a communist.

Although I in no way sympathize with the views or goals of the left, let it be known that this Canadian youth is for freedom; and that is why he opposes John J. Barr and company.

Robert B. White

Ed. Note: STET.

NO SECRECY

To The Editor:

I am very sorry to say that I think the editor wrote one heap of rubbish on Dr. Vant's Lectures.

The lectures are mainly talks to the girls about themselves. Up to that point, we all agree that they are very good and useful. The editorial objects to the "secrecy" involved. There is no secrecy. Dr. Vant was taking on very important PRIVATE and PERSONAL topics, and, as many people know, there are very few girls who like to talk about their bodies with strangers. Dr. Vant closed the doors in order to remove all embarrassment. The fewer red faces, the more learned.

I personally do not agree that girls and boys should be together during these lectures. Girls who may have enough gumption to stand up and ask questions in front of other girls, will lose it all in front of boys. A girl may not understand a certain point, and because she is too shy to stand up and ask about it, may go through life with a certain misconception about sex because "Dr. Vant said so".

Editors are always jumping up and crying "Freedom of the Press." Gateway editors do not know as much about sex as Dr. Vant. If they wrote anything about his lectures, (i.e. what he said), they might give the wrong impression and completely ruin what he wanted to say. If anything has to be written, it should be written by Dr. Vant. Do not forget that if Dr. Vant and the U of A administration had closed minds, we would have no lectures at all.

This does not mean that I agree with Dr. Vant, however. These lectures are not all good. The role of a teacher, as I understand it, is to give the student the facts. All personal opinions are taboo. The teacher may have certain strong beliefs but if he expresses them everybody should jump up and shout "INDOCTRINATION." Dr. Vant has no right to talk about right or wrong.

People who are truly in love and who know about contraceptives do not wrong by having sexual intercourse. This is my opinion; I do not pontificate. Dr. Vant does great harm to young people by bringing conscience and morality into his lectures. Sex is wrong when a girl indiscriminately lets anybody sleep with her—that is true—but sex and love in the right proportion, are the greatest gift to humanity.

Unconvinced

Ed. Note: Teachers, including Dr. Vant, should express their opinion about right and wrong, conscience and morality. And in fact, they inevitably will, whether deliberately or otherwise.

But there is always room for dissenting views. That is why we appreciate letters to the editor.

NO CAMPAIGNING

To The Editor:

Now that the shooting, at least for this campus, is over, allow me to register a small protest against the late campaign to extort, pardon me, draw forth contributions for the United Community Fund. At the outset, let me say that I do not disagree with the aims of the UCF fund raisers, only with their methods of inducing people to contribute. Are we contributing out of a genuine "beneficence or liberality to the poor" (the Concise Oxford Dictionary definition of charity) or are we contributing because we are made to feel a sort of ill-defined guilt if we do not?

I feel that the UCF people (or the WUS people or the Red Cross Blood Drive people who will take up the cross later in the year) should state their case, make all the facts known, let people know how they can help and then let their case rest, letting the contributions come out of a sincere desire to help out others.

As it is, these campaigners are not content to let their various cases rest at this point, knowing that contributions arising out of a genuine beneficence are likely to be small or nil. Thus door to door campaigning and buttonholing in various forms appears. He who makes a definite commitment is "in"—a great guy—a humanitarian! He who does not is to be regarded as something less than a fink—at least a misanthrope—the canvasser being in an excellent tactical position to let one know this.

The term "blitz" is especially offensive, the Concise Oxford Dictionary defining blitz as "an intensive attack" and the related word, "blitzkrieg" as "a violent campaign intended to bring about speedy victory."

Misanthrope

Ed. Note: So sweet of you to hold your fire until the show is on the road. But the cause of misanthropy is lost—everybody is out on the street "blitzing".

AW, IT WAS NOTHING

To The Editor:

You won't Blitz? From my patch of air vapor, I see the SVS campaign as a piece of wonderfully "Cloud Ninish" material, an issue that actually has resulted in 900 people working!

Regardless of my feelings about asking for money, or charitable causes, or United Funds, (I probably differ with you there) the idea of seeing some purpose activate a large section of the campus raises both cloud and campus higher (in one cloud sitters estimation!).

Anne Geddes

Ed. Note: Feels so good to have company up here, dear. I'm likely never to come back down.

THE GATEWAY

Member of the Canadian University Press

Associate Editor	Bev Woznow	Editor-in-Chief	Bentley Le Baron
News Editor	Doug Walker	Managing Editor	Branny Schepanovich
Features Editor	Carol Anderson	Make-up Editor	Dieter Buse
Sports Editor	Bill Winship	Fine Arts Editor	Bev Gietz
Photo Director	Wm. C. Stenton	Tuesday Editor	Peter Kirchmeir
Consulting Editor	Bob Hall	Sunday Editor	Linda Bridgewater
		After Midnight Editor	Catherine Ford

Staff: Richard Kupsch, Bill Samis, Carol Treffrey, Brian Flewelling, Ralph Bat, Bob Dwernychuk, Lynn Greason, Lexy Dryburgh, Z. P. T. Wintterbottom Esq., John Petursson, Don Thomas, Chris Evans, Jon Whyte, Elwood Johnson, Al Bragg, Adriana Albi, Phyllis Anderson, Ray St. Arnaud, Ken Graham, Dave Reece, Sandy Kirstein, David Winfield, Gordon Boulter, Diane Hollingsworth, Susan Gathercole, Betty Davies, Helen Artruther, Marilyn Johnston, Linda Clendenning, Richard St. Arnaud, Raymond Huot, Robin Hunter, Mike Horrocks, Dave Fleming, Shelagh McGulre, Omayya Al Karmy, Ivy Bourcier, Andy Brooks.

Photographers: Kendall Rust, Heinz Mollar, Carl Nishimura, Allen McLelland.

Cartoonists	Ken Rentiers, Alex Kachmar, Don Wells	Business Manager	W. A. Dinwoodie
Advertising Manager	Dieter Buse		

FINAL COPY DEADLINE

For Tuesday Edition:	
News, Notices	7 p.m. Sunday
For Friday Edition:	
News, Notices	7 p.m. Tuesday
Advertising	4:30 p.m. Monday

Opinions expressed by contributors to this paper are not necessarily those of The Gateway or its staff. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein.

Office Telephone — 433-1155

