

About a sane opinion of the university

The Editor,

The article by Brian Campbell on "Anxiety and The University" must surely stand as one of the more sane current opinions on university education.

Of course, one need only be a freshman to realize that the necessary progression towards a degree is not always synonymous with acquiring a university education.

Surely education has as its aims, the evolution and emancipation of a more complete person and not the assembly-line production of a conformists type, with intellect, but precious little mind. There is a reality that the graduate will be one who has no other attributes than the abilities to regurgitate factual knowledge on a test paper, in a specified space of time; and has satisfied certain pre-

requisites that are, in many instances, quite arbitrary. Even more alarming is the deification given to an academic scroll. The package is no guarantee of the content. Of course, the student is not wholly to blame. We are all, in some measure, to blame for the system.

Minds blossom in the sun of freedom. Whether one pursues humanist or scientific studies, either disciplines may achieve basic educational ends—the abilities to assess and evaluate factual knowledge, to think for oneself, to make decisions and judgments.

In either field, one may achieve some measure of personal and intellectual fulfillment—and some measure of perfection. One would reasonably expect some enjoyment from a free choice of courses.

Finally, if one shares Brian Campbell's views, one can only form one opinion of the remark "The grade is the man."

J. D. Harrop
arts 1

Who should you believe?

The Editor,

Is marijuana harmless? The articles in The Gateway last week suggested marijuana is almost as mild as alcohol. Over the weekend, I listened to an Edmonton doctor, Dr. Roy Anderson whose been doing a survey of recent medical studies on marijuana (including one completed just a month ago at Yale). According to him, marijuana decreases a person's mental effectiveness temporarily when used in normal quantities, and when heavily used, the effects can be serious. Dr. Anderson says that it's only within the last year that many doctors have begun to think the effects of marijuana can be really serious.

I'm left wondering which is right: the viewpoint in The Gate-

way or the viewpoint of this doctor? Did the doctors mentioned in The Gateway perhaps have less recent information, is The Gateway reporter's article biased, or are the personal opinions (subjective views) of the doctors just different from the personal opinions (subjective views) of Dr. Anderson?

Elizabeth Bennett
ed 4

EDITOR'S NOTE—In the near future, we will be running on page FIVE (probably in a series of three) excerpts from a document entitled Marijuana and Society. It was compiled by the Journal of American Medical Association and comes to us from Dr. Roy Anderson.

I wish to point out that . . .

The Editor,

I wish to point out that your report of Mr. Stolee's talk to the Philosophical Society (Gateway Oct. 24) contains a misleading statement.

Mr. Stolee is quoted as saying that school boards are comprised of "the most prominent local philistines" who don't care about education and merely want to educate the children cheaply, and leave it at that. This leaves the reader to draw the obvious conclusion that Edmonton's present school board consists of this type of per-

son. In fact Mr. Stolee said there are two kinds of school boards, one worse than the other. The worse type, which Edmonton had until about 1961, was of the type described in your quotation. While Mr. Stolee had plenty of criticism for the current board he did not accuse it of being indifferent to education, nor did he suggest that they tried to keep costs down regardless of the consequences.

O. F. G. Sitwell
Dept of Geography
Secretary,
Philosophical Society

Discrimination in Edmonton?

The Editor,

Upon arriving in Edmonton, I found to my dismay that certain large apartment blocks owned by realtors, insurance companies, or any other large financial institution discriminate against students (I use the word 'discriminate' having the same connotation as anti-negro, anti-semitic and the like).

I also found out that Albertans have a human rights act which insures the rights of the individual.

The point now arises—does the act or any other piece of legislation protect the student from obtaining adequate accommodation?

If these policies are illegal, would the students' union support financially a legal test case?

Earl Silver
Arts 2

This is page FIVE

Spiro Agnew, who is in a position of power unbecoming a man of his intelligence has a unique view of student radicals. Last week, at Bakersfield, California, Agnew called for a "crackdown on scroungy student dissenters" and said they "should be treated like the naughty children that they are."

He said the time had come "to protect young minds" from "the militant criminals" on American campuses. Rounding out his one-sided dialogue, Agnew said "trying to learn from such criminals is like trying to take a bath in a sewer."

Spiro Agnew is the guy who ran beside Richard Nixon all the way to the second top job in the country south of us.

A great guy, huh!

By the way, one newspaperman said this of Nixon—he has been critical of the press since he gave the world Spiro Agnew of Maryland and the press concluded that maybe this was not the Republican Party's greatest gift to the human race or even to the vice-presidency. The writer said old Nixon believes "the press is a kind of inanimate transmission belt that should pass along anything he choses to dump on it."

Are you listening, Miss President?

Contributions today come from our regular columnist Peter Boothroyd and he talks about Jawn Bradley and things like \$25 million and other stuff. Peter has a few interesting facts and these include the opinions expressed by that garble across town.

A note comes from someone who questions opinions of marijuana. There are all sorts of views and soon we will print an uncomplimentary note on Mary Jane.

There is a nice letter about Brian Campbell. We actually got two letters but Brian's modesty prevented publication of a very nice letter.

A last letter from a person who says we didn't do our job. Well, we're human and make mistakes. Unlike a lot of people, we do admit to a certain degree of fallibility. But it isn't easy.

—The Editor

By Peter Boothroyd

Big business will have more control over universities

Last Thursday, Alberta's three universities announced a fund drive. Before we all get out our halloween-apple baskets and start knocking on doors to get the \$25 million the universities are asking for, let's consider what it's all about.

It seems that last spring the universities asked for a total of \$235 million for construction of new buildings over the next five years. The government coughed up \$185 million. The universities then decided to go to the people for the \$50 million difference. But this seemed to be too much to ask, so in some smoke-filled room it was decided that the government would match the public's donations, dollar for dollar. Thus the goal of \$25 million was set for public donation.

Now the question is: why did the government not raise certain taxes to reap another \$25 million?

In the end, they will be paying all but this amount for university construction anyway. Why does the government pay for 89 per cent of the building construction, then refuse to pay for the rest? Undoubtedly, given the perspective of a government largely representing of big business interests, there is some rationality to the plan. Probably given the perspective of the governors of

the universities, who are chosen for their ability to wheel and deal in the nasty world of big-business—big-government, there is some rationality to the plan. There is no point in us ordinary people trying to understand it all—as any of the backroom boys will patronizingly tell us. But what we can do is try to understand the consequence of a move such as this "second or third largest university fund campaign ever in Canada."

The chief consequence is that big business will now have more direct control over the universities. For let us be clear what an appeal to the "public" means. It means getting at least 90 per cent of donations from big givers, i.e., in the \$1,000 and up range. That's a fund-raiser's rule of thumb.

To the extent that the universities are directly dependent upon big givers—mostly large corporations—they will have to be so much more careful that the universities move in a direction to serve these interests. Thus Dr. John Bradley, chairman of the board at U of A, led up to the building fund campaign by ending his report for 1966-67 in the following way:

Industry must decide, as corporate citizens, what their corporate giving is to be in support of higher

education for it is the universities that produce the executives and leaders of our industry.

Authorities claim that a Gallup Poll in Canada, as in the U.S.A. would list education first in priority for national goals. We Canadians want our universities to serve the national goal. We expect them to train enough doctors, lawyers, and engineers. We expect them to provide the answers to our immediate problems. . . .

For knowledge is power. The government knows it. Industry knows it and the people know it. Knowledge is the resource that ultimately pays off for the huge investment it costs to obtain—pays off in production, dollars, and our standard of living.

The university . . . is expensive to operate, but our people and Canada demand it. Our economic growth in this second century of Canada requires it. I am confident Canadians will accept these high costs when they are understood and their governments will take the necessary action to meet the challenge.

Echoing these words in its editorial supporting the fund drive, the Edmonton Journal said:

In cold, hard business terms the

national and international concerns which operate here obviously have an interest. A good many of their highly-trained technical people are available here because the universities of this province are attuned to their needs in various fields. Their business staff and their executives can be hired here and many of them will serve the company for afield. Economically it is a sound proposition for them. Morally they have a responsibility to the community which gives them an opportunity to operate.

Bradley's words, and the Journal's editorial, mark the beginning of what is going to be a long campaign to convince the corporations that the universities exist for them. Unfortunately, the businessmen are not going to be satisfied with mere words. They're going to want action—like more training for their future employees, more practical research in all fields, and most importantly: less radicalism in the student body. And just to make sure they get these things, they are going to want more seats on the Board of Governors. If most of us students haven't yet realized where the power is, the business world always has. After all, power is their thing. If this sounds paranoid, investigate the makeup of boards of universities where the

"public" has been appealed to for years—like McGill.

Since 90 per cent of the donations for the building fund are going to come from corporations anyway, why doesn't the government develop some way of taking the money from them? Business obviously can afford it.

It's unlikely that we'll ever know what percentage of the funds collected are spent on administration of the fund, advertisements, etc., but it will be lots. An appeal to the "public" for public education is a waste of money.

The role of the government is to conduct public business. Let it do that! Education is the government's responsibility no matter how imperfect the representation in the government, there are at least some channels for other interests besides those of big business to be heard. It's true that when the government pays the whole shot for universities, "the national goals" (of business) still tend to be served, but at least there's more chance for change.

Business may say in its double-speak that its donations to universities provide a "margin of freedom" as an article on the subject in last January's Canadian Business claimed, but we should realize they're talking about freedom to serve business interests.