

Varsity Voices

About A Letter

To The Editor:

I wish to question the accuracy of a letter published by The Gateway recently from "a dirty Uke," containing in part a charge that one of the students demonstrating at City Hall on Oct. 21 wilfully assaulted a member of the mob.

To my own knowledge, as a participant in that demonstration, and from reports of others who were present, no such incident took place. Since this accusation has not been substantiated by The Journal reporters or radio and TV reporters, I can only assume that it is solely the product of "dirty Uke's" anaemic imagination.

Ignoring for the time being all the extraneous matter that pads out the letter, one other aspect must be exposed as a shameful affront. The letter is colored by numerous references to citizens of Ukrainian extraction, in a blatant attempt to suggest that there was some kind of ethnic issue involved in the demonstration. The demonstrators were not and are not anti-Ukrainian and I protest this specious attempt to slur public-spirited students and faculty.

Unless "dirty Uke" can satisfactorily substantiate his accusation with concrete evidence, I and others who are continuing to protest must count him a vicious liar.

Anne Wilson
Arts III

Armistice Day

To The Editor:

On November 11th we, members of the Combined Universities' Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, paid our respects to those who sacrificed their lives in two world wars by joining the Armed Forces' march to Convocation Hall, and by placing a wreath beneath the University Honor Roll.

In doing this we showed no disrespect for those who marched in the uniforms of the three services. We like they were sincerely remembering and honoring the dead.

We wish to remind students, however, that the best way of honoring the dead is to strive for a better and a peaceful world. If we do not succeed in this then two generations have died in vain. Ceremonies which are often repeated in a conventional mode tend to lose their meaning. We hoped by breaking through the crust of convention to remind you not only of the fallen but of the purpose of their sacrifice.

John R. Gishler
President
CUCND

Errata

To The Editor:

Normally, I am not one to be too critical of human errors but I feel I must clarify a gross error in reporting. As New Democratic Party representative at the panel last Monday night, I was reported in your Friday paper as having "urged . . . a more wholehearted support of nuclear weapons in Canada." I know I said nothing of the sort and have phoned some people who were present and confirmed my feeling that nothing I said could be remotely construed to mean this.

It has always been the policy of the New Democratic Party to

oppose nuclear weapons on Canadian soil or in the hands of any Canadian forces. We feel that there is no "defence" against a nuclear attack. We feel that the nuclear deterrent may have served some purpose and may still do so until general controlled disarmament can be achieved. However, we feel that there is enough deterrent in the world right now. The great overkill capacity of U.S. and U.S.S.R. armaments is freely admitted by all. The second-strike abilities of modern missiles such as the Polaris with its mobility and the Minuteman with its broadly dispersed, hardened bases is also well known.

The greatest danger we face is a war by accident or escalation. More fingers on the trigger are going to increase the danger. The problems of disarmament, which are almost insurmountable now, would increase astronomically.

Britain only provides 2% of the Western deterrent. What Canada could contribute would be insignificant but would still be a great burden to us. With the present slight thaw in international relations, Canada can do more for the West and the world by working with our Western allies to make sure that the utmost reasonable effort is put forward to give disarmament and demilitarization proposals a fair chance before we are plunged into destruction.

Canada should play a conventional role until a stable peace is achieved. The UN should have more Canadian forces at its disposal on a permanent basis to help it become an effective international policing agency. We should give more foreign aid to help developing nations reach a level of self-support until they are no longer tempted by extremes of undemocratic action, whether of the left-wing or right-wing variety.

I hope you will see fit to print this statement in a place as prominent as the article which did the damage, in fairness to myself and also to give correct information to your readers on the stand of the New Democratic Party. Perhaps some editorial explanation of how the mistake occurred would be appropriate.

Sincerely yours,
William Glass

Chapel Issue

To The Editor:

Some background should be provided regarding the Chapel issue. The original proposal of the SUB expansion committee to the religious groups on campus was for a 500-seat edifice that would have been an appendix to SUB. The majority of the religious groups including VCF, SCM, the Lutheran Student Movement, and the Anglican University Parish agreed that if there was to be a chapel it should be in the midst of student activity. They were in no way interested in a "religious center." They have asked for a small room that would hold approximately 150 students and that would be available for any religious group that might wish to use it.

The fact that there are churches near the campus is not the point. It seems to me that the purpose of SUB is to provide a place for students who have some interests in common to meet together as students and in this particular case to meet together for worship.

Most of us go through our whole university career without

utilizing all the facilities that we pay for through our Students' Union fees—and surely this is reasonable so long as these facilities are used by a reasonably large proportion of students. The religious groups that would like a chapel in SUB do represent a sizeable minority and consequently their request should be considered equally with those of other groups.

Don Munro

About "Socialists"

To The Editor:

The views expressed above the name "Socialist" in Friday's Gateway do not accord with my understanding of that philosophy. I always thought socialists were super-bureaucrats, that a socialist would be only too pleased to have a "dull lot" in education, so that the government could administer it that much easier.

Personally I'm not a socialist. But I am in education and I think that anyone but a biased clod could see the answer to the question posed by the above mentioned "Socialist." Those education students who think, are going into that profession with the intention of raising its standards. They know about the "miseducation" of teachers, considerably more, probably, than Mr. "Socialist" does.

There are undoubtedly education students who are such for negative reasons. The training of teachers is not a well-understood process. There is considerable confusion in the status of this semi-civil servant. How can a serious education student blast a report when he knows there is a good deal of truth in it? But we're down, so keep kicking. Let's just hope we're not socialist when we get up!

J. Loomes
Ed 2

Short and Sour

To The Editor:

In the Nov. 15 issue of The Gateway, Mr. Campbell has criticized the hypocrisy of the Catholic church with regard to education. The word "right" can be interpreted by two opposing sides with equal effect, and Mr. Campbell has chosen the other side of the argument.

According to well-educated Catholics and the Church's teachings the "right" of the parents refers to their prideful heritage, duty, and satisfaction which comes theirs, since they are the co-creators and co-fashioners of their children's (minds) souls.

With regard to baptism the Church emphatically declares that no pouring of water on the forehead, or acid on the spine can by itself make any adult a Christian. It is his faith, and faith alone, together with the prescribed action that completes the baptism and other sacraments of the Church. Little children are baptised so that they may not lose this very special heavenly grace which later they must, according to their talent, prove themselves worthy of through a life of reason and faith.

The field of religion is not reducible to either physical or mathematical formulae, and consequently not very accessible to those with (tangible) limited vision. Christianity is a way of life—a system that gives MEANING to the very existence—as

purveyed by the carpenter's Son from Nazareth.

While going about His task when challenged by proud paranoiacs, He quietly disarmed them of their arguments and sent them away more confounded than they were previous to their encounter.

His followers however, including the distinguished lieutenant Peter at various times hid themselves and EVEN denied their master. Is it any wonder then that many poor unfortunate, perhaps ignorant, individuals exhibit the versatile quality of the turtle? The Biological Sciences explain this competency as a form of adaptation observed in living things in nature which include the species Homo sapiens.

Anyone willing to sacrifice some time and desiring to find more intelligent answers to religious problems and personal intellectual satisfaction is invited to turn with an open mind to intellectual giants such as, (St.) Thomas Aquinas, (St.) Augustine, (St.) Albert the Great and (Cardinal) Newman.

Yours truly,
Asser A. deSouza

"I Disagree"

To The Editor:

I Disagree:

with a police chief who uses our churches as a platform to spew his views and lay his charges;

with those who disagree with Professor Williamson, Robin Hunter, D. K. Buse, The Journal, and perhaps Jon Whyte about such a chief;

with unconditional support of underlings when it entails categorical and unqualified denials of their observed actions;

that this is the first time that such denials have occurred, or that this is the first time denials of receiving phone calls have been made when such denials are expedient;

that recent demonstrators are the only ones to have valid reasons for doubting police efficiency;

that a chief should write letters and deny their context over the telephone, not even taking the care to check his records;

that he should then refuse to stand behind his letters in court because they are favorable to the defendant;

that he should shield his underlings by refusing to disclose their identity;

that high ranking Crown employees should be unable to be summoned into court in the same manner as everyone else to account for their actions;

with casual irresponsibility precipitated by the immunity that such a position enjoys;

that all police chiefs are responsible citizens worthy of their "untouchable" position;

with our moralists who seem to be hounding the wrong man.

Yours truly,
Azar

Marking

To The Editor

"The conscientious professor marks his own papers," states your recent editorial. It is to be hoped that all our professors read

and heed these words.

It would appear that many professors are leading a *dolce far niente* as far as marking papers is concerned. "The professor takes in the papers, makes sure they are on time, then hands them to another person to evaluate." For this, they receive ten thousand a year? What a Paradise for Profs our campus must be.

Marking papers is probably the dullest occupation in the world. I imagine it is very easy to convince oneself that this is something that a marker can very well do. However, I do not believe this to be so. The best person to mark term papers is the man (or woman) who is teaching the class.

University professors undoubtedly have a tremendous marking load. They are not the only ones. I know a high school English teacher who marks five nights out of seven during the entire school year. She has a high record of passes in departmental examinations; her students adore her; and no one says she is lazy.

Some professors personally mark everything that their classes hand in. If one can do it, why can't all?

If, as a last resort, the professor must use markers, I would like to suggest that he mark a portion of every paper. I also suggest that he tell his students before they write the test that it is going to be marked by some one else. It might conceivably affect their answers.

I.M. (Ed 69)

Wells Again

To The Editor:

If I were to remain silent in the face of such inane charges as are directed at me in your Nov. 15th issue, I would seem to be admitting their verity; and yet I find it hard to answer to such irrationality.

Messrs. Munro and Ryan have charged me with literary incompetence, because I used two rather vivid expressions, the images of which they, with their "delicate" tastes, obviously relished; and their preoccupation with them, instead of the messages they conveyed, would indicate, perhaps, some Freudian fixation on their own parts. May I bring to their notice that this "irrelevant profanity" was aptly chosen in reference to the subject which they modified.

And, dear young things, controversy implies intelligence. In order to dispute, one must first THINK. Now, I must admit that "controversy, for the sake of being controversial" IS rather shallow, (although sometimes fun), but even a situation like that would be more appropriate for a university, than the existing situation of almost complete abstinence from thought.

But now, notice, you have gone on to make the ridiculous inference that I condone being "radical for the sake of being radical." This, dear young things, approaches libel! Certainly I approve of radical opinions—providing they are based on sound reason—but not for their own sake; and in any case, The Gateway editorials, mainly, are not only non-radical, but non-opinionated!

For you to support such trivia as The Gateway, under its present policy, only proves your own ineptitude.

D. W. Wells,
Arts 4!