



Bombs, Apathy and Success; Blood Too - What Else Is New?

On The Older Elements

To The Editor:

A reply to Troglodytes, the illiterate.

A student enrolled in the faculty of graduate studies is supposed to be more intelligent than the average undergraduate. I'll agree that this is the case at the University of Alberta. Further, the average graduate student is older than the undergraduate, which tends to make him more mature.

However, the prestige and respect due to graduate students is sapped by the frequent ill-conceived ill-informed babbling of the occasional clot like you, Troglodytes.

1. You falsely accuse us of "bitching" to the administration about parking lots for graduate students. The Students' Council has made ABSOLUTELY NO approach to the administration over the graduate students' parking lot.

2. We do not want to "govern" the graduate students. (Ask your Committee of Fifteen. Ask Dr. A. G. McCalla, the dean of your faculty). Again you are in error. All we ask is compensation for use by graduate students of Students' Union facilities and organizations.

3. You infer that our claim for compensation is groundless; that we provide only a lavatory for the occasional bloated Troglodytes. Again, go talk to your Committee of Fifteen—which has carefully considered many factors and has seen fit to agree to a \$5 fee for graduate students to be paid to the Students' Union.

It is indeed fortunate for you that you did not have the courage to use your name in signing your letter. You clearly do not belong among the intelligent, mature students in the faculty of graduate studies. If you keep your mouth shut and try to stick to facts from now on, perhaps they won't notice your presence.

David Jenkins
President
Students' Council
law 3.

Ed. Note: We have a big daddy dave with a big fierce voice to keep all impudent little whippersnappers in line.

On Empire Building

Dear Student:

On Monday, Jan. 21, 1963 awards questionnaires were mailed to all presidents of registered Students' Union organizations on this campus.

This letter is not a letter of apology; this letter is purely an explanation of our system.

The questionnaire was introduced last year by Ken Glover, the Coordinator of Student Activities at that time. The scheme worked so well we are, in effect, plagiarizing the whole idea. Here's the idea.

Once you receive your questionnaire, we request that you fill it out as fully as possible, noting not just your activities of the past year, but those of your full university career, to date.

Do not be reluctant to expatiate on your activities: these are the only guides we have, by which we make the decision and provision of awards; you are not patting yourself on the back by describing your accomplishments in fullest detail, but rather, you are making a difficult job that much easier for the awards committee.

We solicit your accuracy, hoping that at the risk of exaggeration you will not be stingy with information.

These forms are then to be returned to the secretaries in the Students' Union office not later than 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday, Feb. 6, 1963.

The Committee has a big job ahead of it; the only way to get this task done is to make deadlines and stick by them; on these grounds then, any questionnaires not returned by Feb. 6, will have to be disregarded.

I would like to make the point very clear that this committee is as susceptible to mistakes and errors in judgment as any other. That you did not receive a questionnaire is not to be construed as meaning we do not think you deserving of an award. The number of questionnaires sent out, is only a small per cent of the number we hope to have returned.

If you have not by now received a questionnaire, we take full blame, and ask that you pick one up in the Students' Union Office. If you have indulged in one, or one-hundred and one, extra-curricular activities, you are expected to advise us on your contribution to campus life.

It is you, in spite of how many things you were part of, who have helped to give this campus the standard it has in so many phases. It is only proper to allow us to consider you for awards.

That the value and prestige of a U of A award should fall is directly attributable to the fact that a candidate neglected to apply, who, like yourself, would otherwise have, either by receiving such an award, added prestige value to the very award, or by not receiving the award, made it more valuable to those who did.

We ask you then to excuse us if we failed to mail you a questionnaire directly. Do help us correct our mistake by picking up your questionnaire now, filling it out and returning it within the week, with nary a whimper. Much obliged.

Chairman, Awards Committee
Sincerely,
John Burns

Ed. Note: Due to our inefficiency this letter was not printed last week. The original deadline was Feb. 2, but—as indicated above—is extended to Feb. 6.

They'll Keep Trying

To The Editor:

The James Fenimore Coopers' of society are at it again. With their sentries posted in SUB and the Arts rotunda, these people are soliciting the signatures of the misguided few. Rather than face the responsibilities of this nuclear age, they feel that the government of Canada, the people of Canada and the students of this university prefer to see our country unprotected as Communism confronts us at every quarter. It is time the stable souls on this campus took a realistic point of view and banned together to ban the "Ban-The-Bombers."

If this minority ever gets lucky and succeeds in convincing the populace with their anti-nuclear arms appeal, then pick up your bow and a couple of broken arrows that the Mohicans threw away for we will find ourselves right in Uncas's moccasins or fighting to stay there.

B. Andrews
G. Thompson

Red Badge Of Courage

To The Editor:

It is rumored that certain groups on campus wish to obtain possession of the Inter-Faculty Blood Drive Cup, "The Transfusion Trophy."

Would these groups not get more satisfaction from rallying their members, donating blood, and winning the trophy, rather than stealing it?

The cup will make its appearance when there is a winning faculty announced.

The Best Bloody Faculty

Lafayette-We Are Here

To The Editor:

I would like to make it clear to the student body that the Social Credit Club is very much alive on this campus. Mr. Editor points out that "we" have not heard from "you", but "we" is not clarified—is it the Editor and Associate Editor? the Gateway staff? or does "we" represent the students? The student body may not have heard from the campus club on some of the activities.

In particular, a report on the Nov. 17 convention was submitted to The Gateway but was not used in reporting this event. Yes, The Gateway did mention that the convention took place in Edmonton, but it did not outline the proceedings of the convention.

The next month is the focus of the political year on Campus, at which time, we shall forward to you and the student body, the activities of the Social Credit Club on campus.

Gordon Thompson
Social Credit Club

On Misplaced Hostility

To The Editor:

I should like to comment on Mr. Kellock's recent hysterical attack on U of A Radio, the undergraduate radio society of the Students' Union. Due to a similarity of names I have been forced to conclude that this is the organization referred to by Mr. Kellock when he speaks of "The Students' Union Radio Society".

Aside from the redundancies (un-professional, amateurish) and the vulgarity (bloody . . . slobs, etc. ad nauseum), Mr. Kellock made a number of serious charges. First he accuses U of A Radio members of parasitism. The normal meaning of the word parasite is one who lives off another living being. Except in a very broad sense and one to which he is equally addicted, it seems unlikely that a club embracing seventy-odd people could be "filled with parasites". In fact, a number of these people are paying their own way through university, which is very unparasite-like indeed.

And if Mr. Kellock was referring clumsily to the group as a whole, it will become apparent that in this sense, too, U of A Radio is decidedly unparasitic. It was suggested that we be replaced with "a much more valuable media: . . . SILENCE".

U of A Radio is then charged with playing second-rate music. It is not too clear by what standards Mr. Kellock is judging, but by accepted criteria U of A Radio plays music well suited to its purpose, that is, listenable accompaniment to eating and conversation. We play good jazz, the light classics, and string music of the Mantovani type principally, interspersed with the occasional vocal of a quiet nature. Possibly Mr. Kellock prefers the rock-and-slob trash played by certain Edmonton commercial stations. Finally, it is true that U of A Radio costs the student body some money—the figure is close to 33 cents a student. Now let us see if this expenditure can be justified.

It is conceded by most intelligent people that radio and television programs present one vast wasteland, in the words of a United States Commission on Broadcasting, with a few exceptions like CKUA and the CBC. It is the hope of many radio executives that the next generation of administrators and policy-makers for this industry will come from the

universities. To make policy, these people will have to have a policy and to improve the broadcasting industry they will have to have a better one than that now in force. It seems obvious that they will not gain this depth of judgment from the practices of the commercial stations now operating in this country, so it must be achieved elsewhere. University is the obvious place. Intelligent radio practices could be taught curricularly but this would be a great waste, since the people who will end up as radio and TV executives for the most part do not know so now. Thus an undergraduate radio society seems the right place for people interested in broadcasting to gain some experience in an atmosphere of experimentation and freedom.

As well as this work outside the university campus, our closed circuit network operates eleven hours a day, bringing a variety of music and information about the activities of the campus to listeners in the Students' Union Building. And finally, the News Dept. of U of A Radio sends live reports of campus news to the three largest commercial radio stations in Edmonton every weekday of the university year.

The executive of U of A Radio would like to invite Mr. Kellock to attend one of our executive meetings in the next two weeks or to speak to any member of the executive personally if he still harbors doubts about the worth of U of A Radio, faults included. If he does neither of these things, I would suggest that he publish an apology for his vicious, vulgar and assinine polemic.

Production Manager
J. A. Brook

To Hell With It All

Mr. Bent Lee (Leigh?), Baron;
The Editaurus,
Gait Weigh.

Deer Seer:

Obviously Mr. Whyte has rejoiced. He has Pounded me awake to the fluxure of the po-gory alley. Its rust kin see rite, but don't dare tilt wind, mills, Jon. Stew art, Bert, ranned, and a rustle in her Stocks appeared, but you, Mr. Whyte, are overhexed.

You are punished, Mr. Whyte, wright. Your word's worth naught a swan damn.

St(eve) c(ock)s

Rally Round The Bomb

To The Editor:

The recent statements by retired NATO commander Norstad regarding Canada's military commitments to NATO and NORAD have caused the federal government considerable embarrassment. The reactions to these statements, by politicians within some opposition parties, appear, at this point, to be completely cynical attempts to exploit the Government's embarrassment.

No one should be fooled by the nonsense about honoring our commitments—13 out of 15 NATO countries have failed to honour their commitments—there is nothing sacrosanct about them.

Our answer to Mr. Pearson, and to other "statements", federal and provincial, is that Canada has a more important commitment—the commitment to find a peaceful alternative to the arms race—a commitment which Canada can hope to fulfil only as a non-nuclear power.

According to the Edmonton Journal Mr. Pearson has "put honor before political expediency" and has taken a "clear, unequivocal and courageous" stand, a stand "which

will not be lost on the Canadian voter." We maintain that this stand is one of opportunism. If this is so, and the double-talk about acquiring nuclear weapons and then negotiating a conventional role suggests that it is, then a great swell of public reaction could cause him, if not to (again) reverse his stand, at least to "redefine" it.

To this end we urge that all students and faculty supporting a non-nuclear role for Canada take every opportunity to make their views known. This can be done in numerous ways:

- (1) participation and membership in CUCND.
- (2) informed discussion with friends and acquaintances
- (3) petitions—During the past week CUCND has circulated a petition declaring "opposition to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Canadian forces at home or abroad." This is a national petition being conducted by local branches in universities across Canada. It will be presented to the Prime Minister in Ottawa on Saturday.
- (4) letters to MPs—he personal letter is still the most effective instrument of political pressure for Members of Parliament, providing them with a measure of public opinion.
- (5) model parliament elections—CUCND is non-partisan. We do not wish to suggest that you vote for any particular party. However, in that the question of nuclear arms has become a major political issue, and on the basis of this issue alone, we would urge that you vote for a party which clearly opposes such weapons. If, for various reasons, you feel that you cannot do this, then we suggest that you do not vote for any party which advocates nuclear weapons for Canada.

Graydon Miles
President, CUCND

On Stepping On Toes

To The Editor:

I wish to point out that in our Society success is a most important aspect of cultural achievement. This leads to some inconsistencies. Not only do we think success is good, but we also think that it is good to help unfortunate people.

We do not consider whether these people deserved what happened to them, we just help them.

We praise the successful people without regard to many people they have destroyed to gain this success. How are we to reconcile these views?

Peter F. R. Kirchmeier

Freedom vs Education

To The Editor:

Who's apathetic? You are, that's who. Of 8,000 possibles, approximately 25 students attended the S.C.M. Conference on Freedom.

Why? Too busy, you say—too much study to do. After all, you are here to get an education. What about the 25 who attended? Where does their education come into this? You figure it out.

It's easy to sit back and say "Tsk. You're right. It's a shame nobody goes to those things." What about yourself friend?

Confucius once said, "Great Man demands it of himself; Petty Man demands it of others."

Well—

L.J.D.L.