



editorial

Keep the albatross

This Students' Union has been surviving in the shadow of HUB for so long, and have thus been skirting bankruptcy for so many years, we've gradually come into a grudging acceptance that we'll always have HUB.

Over these years, it would be difficult to recall all the allusions made to the mythical HUB in this paper alone. We've called it a white elephant, an albatross, a spectre of financial insolvency, and more than one student financier has wished out loud HUB had never been built.

Nor can we measure the damages done to the once service-oriented Students' Union simply because your money was out feeding HUB.

We can therefore easily understand why the executive plans to get rid of it. But they're doing it without consulting the people who have all but paid for it. You and me.

After having put so much money into that building, do you want to get rid of it? After having lived with its appetite and its meagre benefits, do you want to part with it now that some people are saying it might become a profitable thing in a few years?

You've taken the risks, you've paid most of the bills, but now that there's beginning to appear a light at the end of the tunnel, do you want to turn around and go back?

The executive does, but do you?

As far as I know, Council is not altogether sure nor pleased with the secretive way the negotiations to shuck us of HUB have begun or are carrying on. Its difficult to report, because so much of the important talk goes on behind closed doors in Council these days. But observation tells me there might be dissension in Council over the negotiations issue, in the light that people are now prophesizing success for HUB.

What do you think? If you think we should hold on to HUB until we know a little more clearly what we might be losing, you'd better get a hold of your rep on Council and ask her/him to get the negotiations stalled.

We've lost a lot because of HUB, but do we want to lose HUB altogether?

- Greg Neiman

U "evils" are force-fed

I don't feel universities are any less anti-personal, politically reactionary, or morally bankrupt than the world that surrounds them, or the people that inhabit them. The university, with all its evils, is no less a jungle than the businesses and societies that end up supporting it.

Larry Fisk's article "The Evils of University Education" printed in the November 6 issue of *Gateway*, is accurate, compelling, and inspiring, yet how much of it is a lament on the impossibility of changing human nature, and how much of it is a call to revolution in making universities virtually the only area in our society where a true education could be possible?

This gargantuan effort at social toilet training commonly called a university could not possibly survive as the type of institution Fisk would like to see it be. The finances prohibit it.

When university researchers deliberately shelve studies which point out failing social services, when the politically valuable findings are given to society but are not used

READER COMMENT

due to the ~~immorality~~ morality of the world which processes new knowledge and academics do not speak out, certainly we are all suffering from the moral bankruptcy Fisk makes example of.

Yet to promote as striking a change as Fisk would like to promote, this institution would crumble in confusion, and probably burn in the heat of political outrage.

The way things are, we cannot do away with large, anti-personal classrooms, or analyse the experience of individual students, and we cannot make public or wisely use the masses of new knowledge and revolutionary findings that university researchers are constantly producing.

Yes, while millions die of dysentery, a handful are kept alive through costly heart transplants, resulting from years of even more costly research.

But what can we do about and still allow the university to survive?

How can we so violently change the academic process that would allow an educator to adequately teach the number that clamour for "education" without first biting the hand that feeds us? Its the world that needs changing, not just the university.

As well we must consider the fact that very few students want the type of education Fisk wants to give them. Do students want to learn while they are here, or would they rather be given the most advantageous means possible to obtain a high status place in society after graduation?

As long as money and status are the driving forces that motivate humanity, neither the academics, nor their collective voice in this institution is going to change anything.

Thus, although Fisk is right in the positions he took in his article, it will likely never amount to more than just another lament on the human condition.

Stan Underwood

letters

Sex is inseparable

As a representative of the Committee to Defend Doug Wilson in Edmonton, I would like to offer some clarification of our position. In your article "Moral Support for Gay Sask. Prof" you quote me as saying that "It is not sexual orientation that is at issue, it is political involvement."

We are concerned lest *Gateway* readers be led to believe that sexual orientation does not figure in Doug Wilson's case. President Begg of the University of

Saskatchewan and Dean Kirkpatrick of the College of Education have both insisted that involvement in the homosexual civil rights movement is the ground on which they have based their decision to veto Mr. Wilson's appointment as a supervisor of practice teaching. However, President Begg has used the fact that the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code does not yet include protection based on sexual orientation to attempt to couch his action and that of Dean Kirkpatrick in an aura of legality. The inseparability of homosexual civil rights as a political movement and sexual orientation as a basis for discrimination cannot be denied.

The reason for separation of the issues lies in the position taken by the University administration. The Committee

itself does not believe the issues are truly separable.

Bob Radley
for Committee to
Defend Doug Wilson

Quotas unnecessary

Quota systems are usually based upon ill conceived ideas and they have a tendency to create additional inequalities unnatural to the already diverse human condition.

Why then do we have quota systems in some faculties of the University? The reason given by these faculties is the age old myth that there are not sufficient facilities available therefore quotas must be established.

Recently the Faculty of Dentistry has greatly increased its quota - bless their hearts. When they did this, they demonstrated (to the awe of other quota faculties) the ease of increasing their capacity. Since then, I think the other quota faculties have been trying to forget this demonstration.

There is something that lawyers and doctors have a difficult time admitting and that is despite their tremendous talents, Alberta still would benefit by having more doctors and more lawyers not to mention more para medical personnel and para legal personnel.

We have the three ingredients, 1. many students who want to become doctors and lawyers, 2. the capacity to produce them and 3. the need for them to be educated. Why isn't it being done?

A survey done after the doctors' strike in Saskatchewan demonstrated part of the answer. This study showed that doctors all across the US are primarily interested in prestige and secondly interested in money. Those who had less selfish motivations like wanting to help the health of the nation had the highest drop out rate from the present system.

Why are qualified people turned away from these institutions, if they have the mental and emotional talents to handle the work? Why don't

