

# The Gateway receives support from other papers, other councils, and others

Mr. Donald McKenzie,  
President,  
Student Union,  
University of Alberta,  
Edmonton, Alberta.

Don McKenzie,  
Pres. Student Union,  
University of Alberta,  
Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. McKenzie:

This letter circulates to protest your decision to show no respect to the elected choice of the Gateway staff as to who should be their editor. To work within a bureaucracy which you obviously represent to the University of Alberta, completely baffles my attempts to rationalize your situation.

Your move has absolutely no foundation. The choice of the electorate should, at all times, be acknowledged as was yours in your election to office. It is very simple for a university to screw their union if the union lacks honor and discretion. Admittedly, you control, somewhat, the capital but freedom of speech can sometimes be an expensive affair and the autonomy within should not become the infringement of an unthinking union.

Ron Yakimchuk is the only choice for the editorship. Aside from his experience, he has the backing of the people with whom he shall work. Respect within a co-operative organization such as the Gateway is vital. Terri Jackson holds no place and no respect.

In so much, the staff of the Eyeopener fully backs the present Gateway people and condemns you for your actions. The decision must be reversed or the University of Alberta will become another statistic in institutions without a voice for the people of its community.

To further back our protest, the Vice-president of the Ryerson Student Union will be contacting you to put his moral support behind the Gateway people.

Yours in protest,  
Mark Bonokoski, Editor,  
Paul Workman, News Editor,  
The Eyeopener,  
Ryerson Polytechnical,  
Toronto.

*Ed. Note: We have received letters of support from many other student newspapers.*

Dear Don;

I am quite surprised at your council's intrusion into the internal affairs of the University newspaper, *The Gateway*. We believe that your overruling of the staff decision to appoint Ron Yakimchuk editor of the paper was an unparalleled infringement on the freedom of the press.

I take the liberty of pointing out that our newspaper, *Pro Tem*, is completely independent of the executive council and while on occasion this has created an embarrassing situation for us it has provided for a greater level of freedom of debate on this campus.

We adamantly protest your decision and urge that you reconsider your action.

Yours truly,  
Paul Johnston,  
President of the Executive Council,  
Student Union,  
Glendon College,  
York University.

*Ed. Note: We have received letters of support from many other Students' Councils.*

To the Gateway.

As a student of organization theory, I think a few notes concerning the February 14th Gateway incident are in order. A social system, (be it an organization like the Gateway or a complex society) in order to function effectively, must be open to change. More specifically, for any system to flourish requires the constant exposure to change (feedback). This feedback is precisely that element which make a system dynamic and responsive to change in a rapidly changing environment. My observations concerning the "power play" which precluded Mr. Yakimchuk from the position of Gateway Editor are analogous to "power politicking" which permeates

"autocratic" organizations. In turn, the existing organization becomes only a puppet to the existing authority and hence the social system reduces to a closed, static authoritarian system, which has indeed dysfunctional ramifications for effective policy and performance (i.e. only biased views are shared). Unfortunately, I envisage for the next academic year a closed, static Gateway organization under the auspices of Mrs. Jackson. It is extremely crucial for students to be made aware (feedback) of the incompetencies of any system for change to occur. If this does not occur then I see the rights of the student being reduced, due to the lack of evaluative information. Hence the Gateway will perpetuate the status quo and reduce merely to an "arm" of the existing administration. In short, growth requires change and change requires feedback, and feedback consists of probing and enquiry. These functions, I deem as the primary responsibilities (especially) of a campus newspaper. If the quasi-elected editor, Mrs. Jackson, is elected, I predict that the Gateway organization will be characterized by conflict, tension, autocratic leadership, resistance to change, decreased performance of what staff remains (i.e. routinization - a fundamental characteristic of bureaucratic structure which enervates creativity), and a "crappy", dry paper void of provocative comment. The above criteria are characteristics of dying, static organizations marked by either bankruptcy or government subsidies. In turn, I envisage increased apathy among students and a serious decline of critical, probing thinking which is vital for growth in a changing environment. The above does not imply that provocative stimulation creates a one-sided bias. Indeed, both sides can be represented as in the case of the recent article on homosexuality.

In summary, I see the role of the Gateway (under the editorship of Mrs. Jackson and hence the administration) reducing to that which is currently pervasive in the

U.S.A.; namely, trying desperately to perpetuate a long lost, outmoded "American Dream" ethic. To me, this is the epitome of the aforementioned static, dying organization. Its up to the students to see that at the University of Alberta, this does not come to pass.

Bryce Archibald,  
Grad. Studies.

Dear Gateway,

As many people have already stated in early letters, the staff of the Gateway has in the past always chosen their own editor. Could it be because they are the only group of people knowledgeable and qualified enough to make such a choice? If this is so, then why has a group such as Personnel Board, who are completely removed from the operational aspects of a newspaper, ignored the recommendation of the Gateway staff? In my opinion this is an attempt to exercise power and control in the wrong way and such a step can only hinder the freedom necessary for an effective newspaper to function.

Truly,  
Ray F. Dallin,  
Director,  
Commercial Leasing,  
HUB.

Dear Mr. Beal,

I would like to add my name to those of others protesting the harrasing of the Gateway staff by the Students' Union. Hope you continue in your struggle to achieve true freedom, not only with respect to the newspaper, but also on the campus as a whole - freedom for students, staff and faculty to work together.

Sincerely yours,  
Douglas Johnson,  
Dept of Biochemistry.

P.S. Where are those petitions that one can sign??

Dear Students:

I don't generally write letters at all, much less public ones. This year's election, however, is rapidly approaching and it seems in many ways to be a crucial one.

Last year, many students (about 106 if I recall correctly) deliberately spoiled ballots in order to show they had no support for Students Council. Period. No one cared who got in--after all what harm could they do in such an ineffectual puppet body?

Now we have examples that the Student Union can sell us out more completely than ever dreamed. Take this whole Gateway explosion as the most dramatic example. Certain candidates want us to involve them, regardless of the type of involvement they stand for.

Until this point, my letter is admittedly vague, perhaps because I don't know what anyone could have done to avoid the present crisis. I washed my hands of Student Council last year and that was a mistake.

Now I must get to the point I originally wanted to make. Last November 3 there was a protest in this city. It was against Amchitka specifically and against The War generally. Many, many high school students showed up (1,200 if you were blind). Only a few university students showed up and this might have been a severe let down to those younger students who sought direct example and leadership at the rally.

Anyhow, shortly after the university group arrived, the Young Socialists began their speeches denouncing and rejecting national and international policies of aggression and war. Almost spontaneously, with no encouragement from the Y.S., the young students began singing O Canada. The song was very mournful and left me trembling with sorrow that our politicians did not stand for a Canada "strong, north, and free". It was a song of despair, lamenting the death of the idea that we can trust politicians to stand guard for us. It was a moving experience. I hope I have moved and perhaps my memory will still move some of you. The new students of this university will not be apathetic to national and international concerns. See to it that they will have an organizing body to direct their dissatisfaction. You don't have to get off your ass, just sit up straight (poor posture is the problem). The Y.S. at that Amchitka rally didn't want to hear O Canada so their ears were numbed to the emotion behind that statement. They did, however, provide the setting for a peaceful demonstration. A good job of organization.

I now will close, but ask you to Think of these students. They care (even if you don't) about freedom. If this University can't be free, they will be crushed. Help them out by pre-determining this university's atmosphere, the choice is yours.

Will the noise here next year be of construction, vending machines and paper plates, or of slamming books, strong voices, and hearty work?

Allan Maisonneuve  
Ed. 4

P.S. We "teachers" have especially poor posture (fat asses).

## COMMENT:

# Council refuses to learn your view

For a long time now Student Council has refused to give any support to the anti-war movement. The excuses have been wide and varied but the answer has always been the same - no support. At the beginning of their term the classic excuse was that they were a "non-political" council. The attempts at busting CUPE local 1368 and most recently the Gateway dispute exposed the farce of "non-political unionism". Last spring the council explained that because they were non-political they could only act in accordance with the views of the student body at large in political matters - a referendum was suggested and half-heartedly promised.

At last Monday's student council meeting a representation was made by the University of Alberta Vietnam Action Committee asking that there be a referendum for March 10. It was to ask;

1) Do you support the immediate withdrawal of US troops and war material from Indo-China? 2) Do you support the demand that Canada should NOT give diplomatic or material support to the US for the war in Indo-China? 3) Do you support the student council playing an active role in support of the movement to end the war in Indo-China?

The referendum would have cleared up the whole debate on the student's views about the war. More importantly question \*3 would have given a pretty good idea about how students felt about the union supporting the anti-war movement. As was to be expected the referendum was defeated. One comment made was that it is "self-evident" about where students stand on the question of the war. It's interesting to note that the opposite of this argument has been used all year for denying support.

At present there are 25 Defense Research Board projects being carried out on this campus at a total of \$126,100. Canada has long been a leader in war research (especially chemical and biological) and is a leading arms exporter-the US being the biggest customer. Students' council's refusal to support the anti-war movement and EVEN to discover the feelings of students, means that it shares in the complicity to the war in Indo-China. Their "non-political unionism" equals the politics of the status-quo- of closing their eyes to Canadian complicity in genocide and closing their eyes to the views of the students at large.

by Larry Panych  
chairperson, UAVAC