

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing editor Ronald Yakimchuk
news editor Miriam McClellan
assistant news editor Glenn Cheriton
casserole editor Marjorie Bell
sports editor Bill Kankewitt
photo editor Chuck Lyall

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Up with People?—We have enough trouble getting them up to the gateway office; anyway, people we can replace but snakes cost money. The collective "we" managed to get, not Misfit, but Miss Nieuwkerk (sans van)—we also didn't miss Laurie Accostek, Dan Jamieson, "Buck-Buck" champion Dennis Fitzgerald, who engaged in a rape in the corridor (he works fast and leaves no ring), Ken (he's the fastest) Bailey, Randy, in parts, Jankowski, Catriona Sinclair, Joe Czajkowski, Judy Samoil, who's rather cheezed off, the Incredible Lump, Jim Peachy-Keen, and Bush Baby, who tried to stick me up the other night, but I, Harvey G. T., was plastered so it didn't count.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1968

Editorial

The "education" process begins today in Casserole

Casserole presents the inaugural article of our bid to "educate" the student populace about the Canadian Union of Students. This is necessary because we will have a CUS referendum January 31 and it is mandatory that students know what they are voting for.

The referendum is important because it could mean either life or death for CUS. Schools have been withdrawing and a few such as Memorial University of Newfoundland want to go back in. As it stands, CUS is in trouble. Alberta's acceptance or rejection of CUS policy could put the lid on.

In order to present a sound base for our readers, we will print representative resolutions passed at the controversial Guelph congress held in August. This service will continue until approximately 10 days prior to the referendum.

In 1966, this university withdrew from CUS. Few students knew anything of the organization or its purpose before the issue was hotly debated on campus. The decision to withdraw, if nothing else, at least made students aware.

The president in that year was Branny Schepanovich and on his

executive were Marilyn Pilkington and Al Anderson, each of whom were destined to become successors to Schepanovich. All held basically the same views of CUS and students at this university were subjected to these views for the past two years.

Brian Campbell, in an article written for the CUS newspaper, *Issue*, takes a harsh look at what he terms "The Holy Trinity" and draws some interesting conclusions.

This article has caused controversy in some corners and made Schepanovich a popular figure at the Liberal convention in April in Ottawa. The CUS national office is located in Ottawa and the paper was freely distributed at the convention.

This then will be our foundation. From it, we hope to build a solid structure of CUS—its purpose, what it serves the purpose, what it is doing, what the prime reasons for withdrawal have been, how it has been treated by the media and what plans it has for the future.

Hopefully, when we finish, students interested in voting will have a reasonably sane idea of what the Canadian Union of Students is and what it may do in the future.

The phone book problem

The Telephone Directory is, as you have undoubtedly noticed, a wipeout. Names have been slapped on the wrong faces, pictures have been poorly reproduced, there was a mix-up in the ad department. The whole is quite frankly not worth the paper it contains.

Students are annoyed at this. They don't like to be distorted, incorrectly named etc. It hurts their image.

Well, its too bad. The directory is an experiment. Part of its new image is because people bitched about the cost of including all photos in the yearbook. Thinking something had to be done to at least get student photos somewhere this term.

So things didn't turn out so well. The whole university is on a kick about "briefs" from students. They say it gives the student view etc.—e.g. council is inviting students to submit briefs for consideration by the committee set up to study the student bill of rights.

Students can therefore send in brief on how to handle the yearbook—telephone—photo situation. You could include suggestions and recommendations and the best of each brief would be inserted in a grand overall plan to get things working the way they should.

After all, it's your money. And your picture they are making a mess of.

Newspapers: there is no such thing as objectivity

By MARK STAROWICZ
(McGill Daily)

The only sector of North American society that has ever produced a viable press is the business community.

The major city dailies, the principal national magazines in Canada and the United States are inseparable from corporate interests, from that community which directs the North American economy.

The reasons for this are obvious: any large newspaper becomes a business in itself, and depends on the business community (through advertising revenue) for its survival.

No other sector of North American society has produced a significant press—not labor, not the intellectuals, not the church, not the political parties. These sectors have produced publications, but never a press that has reached the whole spectrum of society.

This is equally true for all other media, with the exception of a few radio stations in the United States that are run by universities or non-corporate groups and serve the surrounding community.

The capitalist system dictates that only those in possession of small fortunes can control the means of mass communications.

This control of the means of communication by only one of many sectors of society has led to serious abuses, and the creation of several myths we have been conditioned to accept.

And the greatest of these myths is objectivity.

There is nothing wrong, per se, about the business community producing a press. But inasmuch as only that community has produced one, it has created the myth of objectivity to justify its

monopoly of news selection and interpretation in the eyes of other sectors of society who might produce a different kind of press.

A press such as that of the labor movement in its radical period in England produced a very different interpretation of society from the London Times. Without debating which interpretation has more merit, it was important that the English public had access to something other than the one interpretation.

Today, the Canadian people have no access to such alternative daily interpretation of news. They can only get it if they go out of their way to pick up some esoteric political journal at the end of the month.

But the mainstream press maintains the myth of objectivity to rationalize its monolithic interpretation. Objectivity holds that facts rise above all interpretation, that there are inviolable truths which no one can deny. This is patently impossible, and hence the pretence of such is dishonest. The selection of facts, the order of presentation, the play they are given all reflect a value judgment and carry interpretation. Time Magazine has one idea of what stories and whose views are important. The New Statesman has another. When John Ross Bradfield, Chairman of the Board of Noranda Mines gets an honorary degree at McGill, the Star and Gazette simply state this. The McGill Daily includes a story about the nature of Noranda Mines' role in Quebec. The Star and Gazette would not go out of their way to get that story, but the Daily did. On the other hand, The Star and Gazette devoted considerably more space to *Rendez-vous '68* than did the Daily. Whenever a story is printed—or not printed—a value judgment is made. Different papers have different ideas of what is significant.

"Freedom" is your own press

Carlyle wrote a very different interpretation of the French Revolution than did Albert Mathiez. Both worked with facts, but each considered different facts significant. We accept that historians can honestly view the same events with totally contradictory results. No one has gone around pretending there are objective historians. For the same reasons, **there is no objective press.**

If you walk up to someone in Moscow and tell him *Pravda* doesn't always tell the truth, he's likely to laugh and say of course. Chances are fair that if you walk up to someone in New York and tell him the same thing about *The New York Times*, he'll call you a pinko.

Real freedom of the press is not freedom to say what you want, but freedom for every man who has something to say to be able to produce his own press. We can disagree with the editors of *The Gazette* and peddle our message on the corner of Peel and St. Catherine, but we cannot disagree on the same level of effectiveness unless we raise \$11 million.

An underground press could have some modest but significant success if it could only relate to people other than those who have decided that the formula for happiness was set down by Alice B. Toklas. I.F. Stone's small but influential newsletter has started off a chain of similar endeavors in the United States, the most promising being Andrew Kopkind's *Mayday*. These small, four-page newsletters at least offer a running weekly alternative to the gospel according to Associated Press. But they are hardly causing the mainstream papers any worry about competition.

There are several other sectors of society that could produce their own daily

press: labor, the church, the political parties, the universities. All these have sufficient access to funds to enter the arena.

Labor has failed to produce a press because of its internal divisions, and because a large part of it has turned to supporting the present order of things anyway.

Political parties have no need to produce an alternate press as the present mainstream press is theirs already; the press barons and the political leaders come from the same sector and indulge in mutual incest.

The church too is essentially interested in the preservation of things as they are and has no reason to produce an alternative.

That leaves us with the university. This is a particularly interesting area of discussion, since the very concept of a university leads one to think that it should produce a daily press.

The university pretends to be an institution which studies society, its flaws and its strengths. It is supposed to be engaged in a continuing examination of the environment. A daily press is the most obvious device for such an examination. Furthermore the university has a duty to serve the community at large. A daily press would be in keeping with that duty.

The university has the funds to produce at least a significant weekly press. But it will not use its funds to perform any service to society which might disturb the business corporations, to whom it owes direct allegiance. Instead, the university will behave even more conservatively than the very corporate elite it serves.