

Propaganda — does it exist?

The Editor,

Your article on propaganda shows either (1) your lack of knowledge (2) and/or your inadequate ability to search for the truth.

If you are trying to enlighten the Gateway readers, then at least enlighten them in an educated manner. You state and I quote, "The United States of America would have been out of Vietnam some years ago if the brainwashing technique had not been effective." This may or may not be true but you document your statement in an absurd manner. First, you state that in American war movies the Americans always win. Please show your linkage between war movies and propaganda. Do you suppose that all the war movies (you used the term always) producers and directors are far-righted hawks. Haven't the Americans won every major war (if it is possible to win a war)?

You jump to a personal subjective evaluation exactly where you should be objective. Do all American documentaries always justify the Americans? Your use of the word 'always' leaves a lot to be desired. How many after-

And out of the engineering building...

The Editor,

I must applaud the Gateway in achieving a goal.

The Gateway has finally made the grade along with the Clarion. It was even *more* than fair of the Gateway to print Rich Vivone's article outlining the student radicals plans to TAKE OVER.

The radicals now have the power of the press and it is only a matter of time that through press influence that they will have the power of student government. No longer will the average Joe College have to bother about gaining an education from their older and wiser Elders, but will have a select although minority of 'free thinkers' to dictate university policy, (even though some people think it smells of communism). The people of Alberta owe it to the student to foot the bill and let the student run the university. After all, the students knows better.

It is only natural that a student newspaper should give support to the radical elements with wide coverage (even though some people say that such an unimportant minority element does not deserve much coverage).

But of course the *BIG* issue today is to publicize the rise of student power, not to publicize the achievements of the students and the university staff who give recognition to the university. It is more important that the newspaper give space to 'free-thinking(?)' rather than report such facts as concern student affairs (even though some call Gateway policy "Yellow Journalism").

So applaud the Gateway in their unremitting support of tedium, nonsense, and bias as well as those who think that clean fun (sexual or otherwise) is downright sinful and disgraceful.

A. Adams
eng 2

EDITOR'S NOTE—Talk about paranoids and one pops out of the engineering faculty. Give him a wrench and he'll twist his own mind. Tsk! Tsk!

noon shows have you seen in the U.S. in which a bad guy is slant-eyed or speaking with a Russian accent? Is the amount of these afternoon shows significant to sway or influence the continuation of war propaganda(?)

I will admit that the comic strip you criticize is obviously appealing to nationalistic tendencies. But do you really know why you criticize it? You have committed a more serious error than did the writer of the comic strip. If the writer is guilty it is because of the atmosphere of his environment invaded into his comic strip. You have not such defense and therefore are guilty of the more serious error.

Maybe I can add a few facts to your working knowledge on the subject. First, most American documentaries are anti-war (I am expressing only the number I have seen on TV). In 17 years I can remember only one nationalistic documentary and more than 50 that were definitely dove documentaries. These were televised nationally.

Secondly, I have seen a fantastic amount of afternoon television shows in the United States and cannot justify your statement as having any great influence on the public. Thirdly, Gasoline Alley has been running for more than 40 years and I personally doubt if its readers appeal mostly to youngsters.

How can I justify my position? First, I left the United States because of the war in Vietnam and only after convening my conscience as to the war. Secondly, I lived in the San Francisco area for over 17 years (7-24) thus giving me the advantage of gaining more insight in the American culture. How long have you spent in the U.S.?

The Ubysey article on the Gasoline Alley comic strip may have been corrected but they 'passed' it on to a void in the person of yourself (at least in this particular area).

G. Smith
B.Ed.

EDITOR'S NOTE—To answer questions in the order they appear in the letter. When Americans win every war movie they appear in (and it is a long time since we have seen anything to the contrary; i.e. Green Berets, Anzio, Stalag 17, etc.) then we suspect there might be some propaganda therein. Propoganda among other things involve justifying one position and we have yet to see a movie in which Americans appeared justified and the enemy total bastards.

Failure to realize that war movies are propaganda is an indication to the degree they are effective.

War documentaries are written by the winners—as are the history books. We are certain a German or a Japanese documentary on World War II would be quite different from the American reels. Remember that Billy Mitchell predicted Pearl Harbour about 15 years before it happened which might show that he knew the direction the Americans were taking in foreign affairs at that time. Provocation usually precedes invasion.

Children watch late afternoon shows and it is for them we are concerned. If at six years of age a child believes the "bad guys" are slant-eyed or Russian-accented then it is difficult to believe he will change significantly later in life. Watch Stingray, a kiddies show, and see for yourself.

This is page FIVE

More than 12 million Communists attended the meetings of the party organizations. The reports were discussed by 2,700,000 people. This means, comrades, that practically every fourth Communist present at the meeting expressed his opinion about policy of the party and the practical activity of his organization, made remarks and submitted his proposals. Here you have genuine democracy in action.

—L. I. Brezhnev

Campus opinion is expressed here today (in the letters below) and our feelings in many cases is expressed right under the letters.

—The Editor

The opera review was 'an insult to intelligence'

The Editor,

The Gateway's publication of Miss Anita Satanove's review of *Lucia di Lammermoor* last Friday was, in my opinion, an insult to the intelligence of the majority of its readers. If Miss Satanove set out to demonstrate that she knew little about music, less about art, and nothing at all about analytical reviews, then she succeeded brilliantly. If, however, the article was meant as a serious review, then may I suggest the Gateway hire a new reviewer.

Let me explain. After commenting on everything from Donizetti through staging, costuming, acting and dancing, to the behaviour of the audience (of which more later) she barely manages to make some analytical comments on the actual musical performance—and then only by mouthing some of the clichés from the opera's programme notes. Yet surely an analysis of the performance is the main purpose of such a review.

Among the things to which I particularly objected are such obvious fallacies as the claim that the orchestra did "proper justice to Donizetti's music"—a remark that could only be accurate if one assumes that because Donizetti was a third-rate composer, the orchestra accordingly awarded him a third-rate performance: the *petit bourgeois* acclamation of Miss Sills as one of "the three best prima donnas in the world" when I am certain Miss Satanove has heard Miss Sills in few if any other performances and is probably unacquainted with all the other great sopranos of the day; and finally, lumping Cornelius Ophof and Ermanno Mauro into one category as "effectively" contemplating Miss Sills when the latter put on a dismal performance while the former was easily the best of the gentlemen.

But the most objectional part of the entire review was Miss Satanove's snobbish references to the audience. Edmonton audiences may lack "operatic knowledge", but they at least have the kind of joyous enthusiasm that more "sophisticated" audiences lack. I for one, however, prefer spontaneous enthusiasm to the "correct" behaviour of beminked and besmeared ladies and gentlemen of "polite society", such as I have met at the *Staatsoper* in Vienna, *Lincoln Center* in New York, or even at *Place des Arts* in Montréal, who invariably dress with impeccable taste, know how

to hold a brandy glass properly, and who have musical knowledge but no musical sensitivity.

"What is a connoisseur?" asked Oscar Wilde rhetorically, and replied with profound truth, "A man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing!" To the parvenu culture vultures of this ilk, opera is not a question of artistic sensitivity but of social graces. This attitude is more dangerous to the survival of high-quality artistic endeavours, than a million people clapping at the wrong time.

There is nothing wrong with Miss Satanove that intensive kindergarten seminars cannot heal, however, and since I like to be constructive in my criticism I am more than willing to give these. For such purposes she may find me in the history department.

Franz Szabo
Graduate Studies

EDITOR'S NOTE—We have no intention of hiring another reviewer. We are quite happy with Anita Satanove. Her reviews indicate her criticisms—as they well should.

About the university and representation

The Editor,

In Tuesday's edition of The Gateway there was an article about the three persons who going to represent the students on the Presidential Selection Committee.

Who chose them?

I believe it's about time students organize in a democratic way by staging an election on who should represent them. How can these persons participate in the choosing of the next university president and say they represent the student body at The University of Alberta when they haven't gone through the democratic process of a majority vote by students?

Frank Lewis
comm 1

EDITOR'S NOTE—Well, Well. Here's a man who thinks. Maybe he and other students should think about the fact that the two students on the Board of Governors are chosen by the personnel board (or a students' council committee—same thing) as are the two students' union representatives on the General Faculty Council. That is students' union-type democracy.

A letter about Dr. Walter Johns

The Editor,

I can't believe Dr. Johns is serious in his remarks about "long-haired types" in last Friday's Gateway. He seems desperately righteous when referring to "the relentless march of evil" to which he assumes students are committed. He seems curiously condescending when he says he believes "that their actions are malicious" contrary to his "feeling." He claims that they have "lost their sense of fun . . . have no sense of humor." All this from the most humorless man on campus (well, maybe just one of them), who offers his guests Harry Boyle's "Mostly in Clover"!

I don't think Dr. Johns understands what is going on. There is a generational difference. The problems we see as students, as an underclass, he does not.

What is more important, I don't think he wants to understand. Over the holidays I saw him on a CBC-TV interview. He claimed student radicals were subversives who came from other countries. This is a form of witch-hunting. There is no evidence that this is so. I once learned (and at this university) that when some peoples are ignorant of the causes of disease they blame witches and evil spirits. Dr. Johns seems to be at this primitive level of critical understanding of the relationships within and without the university. Of course anything he can't explain must be due to those "long-haired" subversives.

Murray Williamsen
arts 3

Pacifists don't bring changes

The Editor,

True, the only way to change an organization so it represents yourself is from within. Logically, this makes the pacifist victory which will keep the U of A out of CUS for a couple of years a poor excuse for a victory.

Yet if one used common sense he would realize pacifists will not change their policies, if they have policies, with a "yes" vote for CUS. The activists, a minority not representative of either Canadian or U of A students in general; would, because of their nature, still run CUS.

The advocates of change, be it good or bad, will always be active and willing to work for their cause. Therefore the U of A can never be represented by CUS or any other organization unless the students here begin to care about themselves and their society.

Active need only mean for the majority to become interested enough to know the issues of an election and to vote on the basis of information evaluated by themselves. Active need only mean to read the election posters and leaflets and to take a few minutes to hear a few orations. Only when the total population of a democracy can vote on the basis of sound judgment of all the issues will a democracy function as it should. Only then will organizations like CUS be controlled by the majority of the people it represents—not the present minority. Only then will the majority cease to be manipulated by the more active few.

Jim Basnett
Industrial Arts
ed 1