

Scholarship fund is unjust

Dear Mr. Horsman:

We read with considerable dismay the announcement in the *Gateway* of the new scholarship fund the government is bringing out. Many people have congratulated you on the establishment of such a thorough scholarship program when this province has always been notoriously weak on that front, and certainly such a program is an excellent thing, the amount of money dedicated to it alone being quite staggering. But to employ such a large sum in the manner outlined in your proposal is a dreadful waste of a great opportunity.

To begin with, a scholarship is primarily a recognition of a student's academic accomplishments. It is meant to encourage scholars, not to be part of a cash prize system. It is not a bursary, though it can certainly serve as one, and should in many cases (for instance, it is only reasonable that a scholarship for a graduate student should cover not only his tuition but his living costs). To automatically pay first year students \$300, \$500 and \$700 for their high school grades is quite unmerited. A high school student who achieves a standing of eighty per-cent is not accomplishing all that great a feat; recognition of good marks is a wonderful thing, but such recognition would be amply represented by a hundred dollar cheque for each year. The sums suggested are far too large, for no real reason.

Secondly, you intend to give these awards to every high school student with an average of eighty percent or above, whereas you intend to give out only five hundred \$3,000 scholarships to all of the second, third and fourth year students in Alberta. And yet these undergraduates are the students who really merit an award. To get a 7.5 average at a university is a genuine accomplishment. These are the students who are really bright, and really deserving — often not only academically, but financially as well. Here, where it really counts, you suddenly become oddly stingy, especially after your generosity, lavish to an extreme towards first year students.

We are more in favor of your plans for graduate scholarships, but even these seem too large. We would rather see these halved in quantity and doubled in number, so that more students could be adequately helped.

Poet displays prejudice

About that piece in *Gateway* you titled "To the Fruits of 'Gaiety' and Dignity," — I have two questions for you (the editor).

1) Why did you choose that headline? It suggests that you share a common prejudice, and that you like to show that you are clever. Being clever does not give you the right to insult people.

2) Why did you allow Alexandra more than 250 words? I presume that this piece was a letter, as a column by a member of the *Gateway* staff it would be such a piece of nonsense that I doubt you would publish it. On second thought, perhaps it was written by a staffer in the hope of starting a controversy that would keep your pages humming. If that is the case, let me try to help by suggesting that the chief issue raised by the piece is not sexual orientation, but the nature of religion, for I see the piece as being an example of superstition

It seems to us that it in general much smaller sums were paid to graduate students, to first year students, and perhaps even to the remaining undergraduate students (sums which were proof of recognition of high academic standing, and not meant to be bursaries), then the money saved by such restrictions could be put towards something more worthwhile — like the total abolition of all tuition fees for all students.

The government's scholarship fund employs a huge sum of money (though perhaps not as huge as it should be — why do you have only 5.3% interest?) in a very indiscriminate and rather pointless fashion. In its overly great generosity to first year

students and its peculiar restrictions in regard to undergraduates, it demonstrates a lack of thought and reasoned planning which is damaging to the government's image and of hardly more positive value to the university community.

We can only hope that the scheme will be given further consideration, and considerable alterations implemented before the plan comes into effect. Otherwise, the tax-payers will have to put up with the uncomfortable knowledge that their dollars are being spent unwisely, while their children are getting no better a university education than before.

Katherine Orrell
Katherine Trumpener

Don't throttle freedom

I would like to write a reply to Mr. Hayes' letter commenting on my article against helmet laws for motorcyclists.

That Mr. Hayes places the value of the almighty buck over an abstraction like personal freedom is not surprising to me, although it is a little saddening. If in the interest of economy and efficiency such things are to be lost, then our culture has entered into a spiritual cul-de-sac from which there can be no hope of return. These are the words of an prisoner of men who dare to have free will in a society of anamatonns. He talks of premiums and dollars. I talk of one of the things that makes life

enjoyable, indeed even bearable.

Gone would be the mountain climbers, the hang-glider pilots, the canoeists, the skiers, all who put their personal safety behind a task of joy, a flight of fancy; they would be extinct by the efforts of those who value security over the chance of finding joy in doing the dangerous. Soon the walls that such a person builds will come falling in upon him.

I do not care to be called names by such a one.

It is easy to shout insults at a bull in a pen, but once the gate is opened, beware.

Harley Hashman
Pharmacy

God isn't anti-gay

Re: "To the fruits of 'Gaiety' and 'Dignity,'" Wednesday, October 15. So what? Alexandra wrote the piece. One can't blame whoever the author really is for not wanting to be known by his/her/their real name(s). It takes a lot more guts than they've got to sign one's name to a bit of printed word that so boldly declares one's ignorance.

Ah me! So the old seduction myth of old-man-getting-young-boy-and-turning-him-into-a-homosexual is still around, eh? How cute!

And the misunderstanding of God's justice and judgment is really wild. I get the impression that "Alexandra" accepted Christ so that she could get God on her side and then use Him to mete out Divine Vengeance to satisfy a personal grudge of hers. Sorry sweetie, but God is a lot bigger than you imagine. Maybe "Alex-

andra" might try reading *Markings* by Dag Hammarskjöld (who was Secretary General of the U.N. from 1953-1961) and have a look at just how intimate a relationship can develop between God and a homosexual. Or if "Alexandra" doesn't want that, just go to the Bible which "she" enjoys quoting: "...I most certainly understand now that God is not one to show partiality, but in every nation the man who fears Him and does what is right, is welcome to Him." Acts 10:34,35

Glenn Kowalsky
Medicine II

Paper a letdown

I'm not sure who Alexandra is or why he/she/it felt prompted to write that rather graphic piece of literature but frankly, folks, I'd rather not have it flashed in my face in my free copy of the *Gateway* (i.e. - what was the point?!).

Keith Krause seems to have forgotten that a good editor should be more interested in quality, not quantity. What seems to have happened with this issue of the *Gateway* (and I'm afraid to say most issues this year) is that advertising money is supplying enough cash for a certain number of pages. Therefore the staff feels obliged to fill that number.

I'm disappointed - not only with "To the Fruits of Gaiety and Dignity" but with this entire year's production of newspapers.

Surely in an academic institution of this size there are people who can produce articles pertinent to the student's life, and not just filler.

Karen Stephanson
Arts II

Savard solves all

There is an inherent difficulty in writing a letter to the *Gateway*, or in fact any newspaper, for me. There are, usually, just so many things to write about.

There are at least two columns by Eddie Keene in the *Edmonton Sun*, for example, that I could comment on. He had a column some time ago on restaurant walkaways which, while roundly criticizing those who do such things, failed to comment on the morality and propriety of restaurant and bar owners placing the burden of customer defaults on employees. An odd omission, considering that I have heard him described as a progressive of sorts (myself, I have not read enough of his columns to be sure of this).

Labor legislation to prevent such practices is, in my opinion, sorely needed: that it might encourage slightly such crime is not enough to outweigh the fact that it will greatly reduce the suffering it causes; also, the restaurants, not the waitresses, have the economic power to take security measures against walkaways.

Then there was the recent one on how \$3,000 damages for the death of a child is ridiculous. Again, he missed the obvious. The government is correct in saying that such a pittance accurately reflects the tangible losses of the relatives of a dependent deceased, but when someone is killed by negligence, who is the real, and very tangible, loser?

The one who is made dead, of course! It is the person who is not being compensated adequately, by not having his resurrection from the dead paid for by those who are liable for his death.

At present, however, the law does not recognize the right of anyone to make a suit on behalf of a dead person.

Of course, the obvious objection of technological infeasibility will be brought against the idea of returning life to those who have lost it. My reply is that such an objection is entirely irrelevant: for one thing, cryonic suspension is available as at least a partial measure of positive benefit, and it costs a lot more than \$3,000 and for another, the cost of saving the victim of crime harmless should naturally be considered to include the cost of any necessary research programs required to do so. The notion that science will never, ever be able to resurrect the dead is, of course, merely religious superstition which does not need to be refuted at length.

Then there is the recent news. Except to indicate that Trudeau's unilateral action on the constitution might not be all bad, had it the effect of moderating Bill 101; but, of course, Bourassa's Bill 22 should have been disallowed, rather than waiting until the eve of Claude Ryan's election (apparently, he will repeal this law, despite the fact that he does think everyone in Quebec ought to be able to speak French.) However, someone in a letter to an Edmonton newspaper, named Peter Loughheed for even hinting at a separation referendum, because the country

will survive Trudeau. When he starts messing with the constitution, that ceases to be true.

Whenever I read of another theft, murder, or rape in the paper, or see new evidence of vandalism, I wonder what our schools are doing. The school is responsible for creating good citizens who respect the rights of others; those who grow up to commit serious crimes ought to be detected and given treatment to ensure that they will not become adults without having the empathy for others that prevents you and I from running amok.

Yet, after the last two paragraphs, I still have to admit that I cannot envisage creating by advanced psychological engineering a nation of people who, on the one hand, are inherently unable to drive over the speed limit, smoke where there is no smoking sign, or cross the street at the wrong place, and on the other hand are fully prepared to take up arms against the government to overthrow it the moment it intrudes on their fundamental liberties. For one thing, this would require a definition of the difference between freedom and license so precise that it could be fed into a computer.

Finally, I must criticize one aspect of the *Gateway's* editorial policy in relation to letters. Specifically, its refusal to accept letters debating the subject of abortion.

If I'm right, thousands of Canadians are being killed each year because of discrimination by the law against them; if I'm wrong, the lives of many Canadian women are being profoundly disrupted for the sake of a minority religious dogma. Either way, few issues could be more important.

Of course, abortion is an emotional issue, like capital punishment, bilingualism, and so many other things. Thus, a lot of the same arguments are heard over and over.

If the same issue is debated, one hears the same arguments — at the start. But when the debate continues, each side apparently refuting the first arguments of the other, both sides are forced to discuss the hidden assumptions behind their arguments, thus moving to more and more profound philosophical issues and raising the level of the debate.

An examination of last year's *Gateway* will show that this process was just beginning to bear fruit at the very moment that it was nipped in the bud (forgive the pun) by the announcement that the *Gateway* would not print nor would its letters' editor even look at any further letters on the topic. It is this that lends an ironic aspect to the stated reason of "tired old arguments" for this policy.

Considering your "section B1" photograph, I could discuss part of a previous letter of mine to the *Journal* that they didn't dare print...but this letter is amorphous enough as it is.

John Savard
Grad Studies

Free the whole world!

Hostages

Free the hostages!

in Iran
the leftists in Chile
the crowded in Walla Walla prison, Washington
the workers, Black and punks in Brixton gaol, U.K.
Liberate phony Democracy Wall, Peking
the victims of apartheid in South Africa
Stop the forced sterilization of poor women.

Rescue the Hostages!

of authority, power-trip, behavior modification
in senior citizen ghettos
of fat boy capitalist thieves
Release the anarchists in Spanish jails
democrats in Cuban prisons
radicals and lawyers in Social-Democrat, perfect
police state, West German cages.

Untie the Hostages

the palestinians in Israel
the Jews, Ukrainians, Latvians, union organizers
in U.S.S.R.
the dopers in Turkish jails
the "disappearing" in fascist Argentina
the drafted in army(s)
Stop the forced drugging of mental patients.

of violent, sexist, macho advertising
of future poisoned 3 Mile Island(s) from radio-T.V. half
truths
from C.I.A.-K.G.B. Terrorists
from work ethic fanatics
from Anita Bryant, fundamentalist prides.

Pardon the Hostages!

the bored schoolchildren
the unemployed in Watts, L.A.
the young junky in Bed-Stuy., Brooklyn
the Sioux at Pine Ridge, South Dakota
Stop the deportation of Mexican and Haitian workers.

Liberate the Hostages!

in Timor, Euzkadi, Ireland, Zimbabwe,
Kurdestan, Quebec, Puerto Rico
the majority Indians in Bolivia
the famished in Cambodia
the Rastas in St. Vincent.

Emancipate the Hostages!

of Big Oil
of Kings and Shahs
commisars
cops
gurus
Moonies
K.K.K. - Nazi creeps
bigot, patriot, war-hawks
of ayatollahs
popes
politicians
bureaucrats
missiles
borders and
a million deceptions.

FREE THE HOSTAGES!

John McIntosh
Grad Studies