

VIEWPOINT

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1965

PAGE FIVE

Shoeless

To The Editor:

It is common knowledge that most of us, students are poor, but not desperately so. However, I am finally on the verge of coming into direct contact with one who either is in rags or else is a crook. Yes, you sitting there in your newly acquired shoes and reading your free Gateway, I am talking to you! Assuming that you are not in dire need of my old, stained, worn, somewhat smelly, and oh-so-comfortable green hush puppies, could you please put them back in the coat room in Rutherford Library. I don't feel like walking around in my boots for the rest of the year.

Literally shoeless

Tax Time

To The Editor:

I agree that your editorial of Jan. 29 expresses the monetary problems of quite a few students, but I believe the problems of a sizeable number have been ignored.

There are the students who earn, through hard work, enough money to finance their year, and have income tax deductions made accordingly. The government

makes the error of taking total deductions (in my case) of four times the tax required. I believe then can calculate better than this.

However, both the government and my employer are willing to rectify the error. In the middle of January on almost the same day I received a personalized T1 short form and a T4 form. By filing these in, I can recoup nearly \$200. But I have not sent this material into the taxation office for lack of one small item—receipt for university tuition. The information necessary to compile these receipts was available last October, and surely they could have been compiled in time to arrive with the T1 and T4. Please! I want my money back.

Yours truly
Robert Freeman
eng 4.

"Great Societies"

To The Editor:

I have read one of the few articles worth of being mentioned in your publication *Inside*. I am referring to the article written by Bruce Ferrier entitled "The Great Society." It causes one to reflect upon our own society, here in Alberta, and especially here in Edmonton. Perhaps the criticisms directed at the American society may be aimed at our own, also. I think that most of us would agree that they could, (an obvious truism, no doubt).

Viewpoint writers take note of the risks and high cost of being a university student; take issue with our 'great society' and Alex Hardy

Why has this happened here? The general reply now is "because of the Social Credit government." Yes, I would agree that this is one cause. Our government makes mistakes, and, in deed, very severe ones. One becomes thoroughly disgusted when supposedly mature men act in a manner not worthy of a human being. But, let me pose one question to the students and to certain professors on this campus. Cannot the description of the men in our legislature be applied equally to the people of this campus and to their criticisms of the government? Are we not acting in the same manner in criticizing them as they in criticizing us? The description does hold! We are no better than they: we are ignorant, immature, intolerant, hypocritical! And when we resort to the tactics of name-calling and slandering, and when we criticize for the sake of destroying people and institutions and not for the sake of constructing, one can see why our society is the same as "the Great Society." It is not a characteristic of civilized people to use an eye for an eye method of justice; it does not fight intolerance with intolerance, hatred with hatred. Change and improvement results only if the individual himself improves; and one is able to do this. The change must first come within each of us. Until we mature, the characteristics of "Johnson's Great Society" can apply to our's and to us.

Yours sincerely,
S. M. Kolber,
Arts 3.

University "Image"

To The Editor:

I was very much disturbed to read (on the front page of last Friday's "Gateway") the statement that our university's president had to make concerning the

student publication, *Inside*. He said that it "does a tremendous amount of harm to the university," and that, of course, is nonsense.

He may have had more reason to say that it does harm to the university's image; that, in fact, is probably what he meant. The disturbing part of it is that the president fails to make the necessary distinction between the university and its image.

It is quite understandable that the president, as the university's chief public relations officer, should be very much concerned with its image, but when he mistakes the welfare of the image for the welfare of the student community itself, he is in a dangerous state of mind.

He is quite right to say that "The university should foster creative and imaginative writing which will reflect the students' viewpoint," but he simply fails to perceive that that is precisely what *Inside* is trying to do. He must learn to reconcile himself to the fact that the students' viewpoint is their own; it will not always be pleasing to the Mrs. Grundys of public opinion, nor conduce to his own notion of the proper public image of our university.

Jim McDonald
arts 3

Kachman Defended

To The Editor:

Re your editorial of Jan. 29, (Clarence Kachman—A Legend At 23) as reported in Sports Chatter, we feel it is our duty to the university to point out several fallacies and to expose glaring discrepancies therein.

Item No. 1—Mr. Kachman was described as 5' 8" and 150 pounds. This is completely false! As of this moment his weight is 147

pounds, height 5'7 1/4".

Item No. 2—To quote Clarence Kachman . . . "I would never throw a game in my life!"

Item No. 3—To the best of our knowledge, Mr. Tom Connelly has never approached the numerical agility (69er's) of the aforementioned C. Kachman.

Next, we would like to correct the erroneous beliefs that may have arisen as a result of the unfortunate and malicious use of the name "Watson" in reference to a bookmaker. We feel that this is a derogatory allegation to make about a person of such high moral and ethical character—in fact both parties, Kachman and Watson, have been unjustly accused.

As we realize your editorial space is limited, we will not elaborate on any other journalistic errors included in this article, but if Mr. Hardy would like to apologize to members of this household, he would be most welcome to come and discuss the matter with us over a "soda" at his convenience.

Messrs.
James Alexander Watson,
Clarence Earle Steininger,
Brian Gordon Harris

Editor's Note: Mr. Hardy gladly accepts your invitation. However, any suggestion of an apology will not be entertained. The Gateway sports department is considering an investigation into the activities of Messrs. Watson, Steininger and Harris.

Name Please

If the "rather irate student" who wrote a letter to the editor would like to sign his letter The Gateway will be pleased to print it. While we will print letters with a pseudonym all letters must be signed, preferably with an address or phone number included.

The Editor

Les McLeod Under the Gavel

Mrs. J. Grant Sparling, Dean of Woman, has been invited to present to council at its next meeting her reasons for proposing that all first-year women be strongly encouraged to live in residence. Is the next step compulsory residence for all first-year women?

Ideas of this kind I strongly oppose. I do not know why this proposal is put forth—but I have some guesses.

I think first-year women are assumed to need protection: from sex and from themselves. To further this, residences impose a compulsory night arrival hour, allow a limited number of late nights, and completely remove the chance (heaven forbid!) of having males anywhere near the intimacy and sanctity of a girl's abode. Further, they are supposed to encourage discipline and study, give the inmates a proper diet, and in various and sundry ways provide parents with the assurance that the little darlings won't be exposed to "harmful influences."

There are two defects to the above theory: the first is it doesn't work, having in practice the opposite effect.

There is nothing more guaranteed to encourage irresponsibility than having others take responsibility for your actions. To put it bluntly, how does one learn sexual discipline until one has to practice it? People of college age are too old to be forced into what is "good for them" and the only way of helping them is to treat them for what they are: somewhat inexperienced adults.

And the second and basic defect: a common failing of a segment of our (and probably any) university administration: they don't treat students as the *raison d'être* and indeed as the university, but as pawns to be moved around for the deification of concepts of efficiency and expediency.

If a student is to really learn from university, it must be on the basis of adult responsibility for his or her actions, and thereby the development of self-discipline, self-analysis, and (hope, hope) even some independent thinking.

And the curious fact is: at this university, due partly to the wisdom of some of our administrators and partly to our traditions, students have been given and have accepted successfully the highest degree of responsibility. Almost uniquely on this continent our students' union is graced with a fantastic amount of autonomy and trust. In order to retain it, we must oppose more administration control, and the philosophy from which it stems.

Education -- Privilege of Rich?

High Tuition Fees--Who Suffers Most?

The writer is the editor of *The Varsity*, student newspaper at the University of Toronto. In this editorial, he comments on a student opinion survey his newspaper ran last week on university tuition and summer employment.

By Harvey Shepherd
reprinted from *The Varsity*

We have mixed feelings about the results of a survey taken by *The Varsity* last week on student attitudes towards summer jobs and tuition fees.

The attitude expressed towards tuition fees was most discouraging. Almost 55 per cent of U of T students apparently believe that it is right and proper that students should pay them. Fifty-five per cent of U of T students, we must conclude, do not accept, with all its implications, the theory that education should be freely offered by society to every young person to the extent that he can improve himself by it, and thereby profit society. Fifty-five per cent of the U of T students have yet to get rid of the notion that, for the student, education is, not a duty to be performed, but a commodity to be bought.

On a less theoretical plane, we would remind this 55 per cent that those who suffer most from the existence of university fees are not they, nor any of the other students at this university. The fees may have caused them some inconvenience—for some, great inconvenience—but they, after all, are at the university. Those who suffer most are those who have the intelligence and the character to be at university and, for financial reasons, are not at university. Or perhaps it is not even they who suffer most—since they are intelligent people living in a time of, by and large, fairly good wages—but society, which will be deprived of their services as educated people.

AID EXPANDED

We would presume that most of those who believe in paying tuition fees are in favor of scholarships and bursaries to help the less wealthy to university. They probably also believe such schemes should be expanded. And, any expansion of such schemes is, of course, a welcome thing.

We may even be approaching the day when there will be some sort of guarantee that university education will be open to all university students of a certain academic level. But, while tuition fees and the rationale behind

them continue to exist it nonetheless will mean that, although brains and character may gain entrance to university for some, education will for others remain a commodity to be purchased. Or, at the least, it will mean that some sort of means test will be required to decide whether, for any particular young person, an education is to be noble duty or a marketable commodity.

PRIVILEGED GROUP

Many of the 55 per cent probably believe that university students are a privileged group, most of whom, after all, have it pretty soft, and that the university student owes something to the society that is educating him.

We heartily approve of this view. They are absolutely right. The debt of an educated person to society is profound. But he pays it by using his educated point of view, and the talents he has acquired through his education, for the benefit of society, both while he is at school and afterwards. The university student does not pay his debt to society by writing a cheque for \$500 of the old man's money, or even of his own. The continued existence of tuition fees can, indeed, serve only to help perpetuate the notion that to be educated, far from being a state which imposes strenuous duties, is a privilege of the rich.