

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - - lorraine minich

managing editor—jim rennie

news editor—joe will

production manager doug bell
assistant news editor elaine verbicky
sports editor steve rybak

casserole editor ronald yakimchuk
photo editor ken voutler
make-up editor frank horvath

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Well, two new staffers put in an appearance, and I hope more sign up soon because it can get pretty lonely in an empty office at night. Those that come included Alan Clifford, Harry Diemer, Glenn Cheriton, Pat Mulka, Bernie Goedhart, Dennis Fitzgerald, Alex Ingram, Marilyn Astle, Marcia McCallum, Bill Kankeiwit, Neil Driscoll, John Boyd, Jim Muller, Jean-Paul Sartre, Dave Applewhite, various other assorted reporters and photographers and the ever faithful, ever present, simple serpent, yours truly, Harvey G. Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published twice a week by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Tuesday; Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Gordon Frazer, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Librarian: Suzanne Brown. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1968

at last — booze

The University of Alberta is a progressive, liberal, open-minded place after all; the powers-that-be have decided to allow the old-timers who come back to campus next fall for Homecoming Weekend to have a drink in the students' union building.

This is a step in the right direction; the only way this building will ever be used to any extent for banquets and formal social functions is if it is extended a liquor license.

According to Dr. Johns, the success or failure of the Homecoming Weekend banquet will determine whether or not liquor will be brought into SUB in the future.

So it all depends on the folks. If they don't throw any furniture, break any dishes, or misuse the guest rooms, we may see the day when banquets and formal dances on campus won't have to be milk and kool-aid affairs.



"i know your son likes to act, but studio theatre doesn't usually produce goldilocks." (how about barefoot in the park?)



"looks like henderson's skipping his criminology lab again . . ."

something in common

It is regrettable that the Graduate Students' Association has decided not to join the students' union.

We can appreciate some of the arguments given against full membership—things like a loss of autonomy for the GSA and a great diversity of interests.

But, we cannot buy the idea that grad students have nothing in common with undergraduates.

There are projects and areas of general student concern which will work only if all students on campus get together.

Both the unions realize the need for student-provided, student-operated residences. In order for this idea to gain the approval of the Board of Governors and get off the ground, the GSA and the students' union are going to have to co-operate.

The grad students, many from the standpoint of being lecturers, and the undergrads, from the standpoint of being students, could derive mutual benefit from co-operating on projects such as academic

reform committees and course evaluation.

To say "we have nothing in common" is a gross inaccuracy and a somewhat pathetic declaration of independence.

The most understandable hang-up is the fear of a loss of autonomy, and this can be attributed to a communication problem.

GSA president Peter Boothroyd, speaking to students' council two weeks ago, outlined what kind of a guarantee of independence for GSA council would have to ensure in order to sell grad students on the idea of union membership.

Council outlined what degree of independence they were willing to guarantee.

Basically, the two parties said the same thing, but an argument over semantics caused the GSA-favored motion to fail.

Both sides are partially to blame for the breakdown—mainly because they can't seem to get their heads together.

government for and by the people — democracy

By GLENN CHERITON

In case you haven't heard, the Vietnam problem has been solved. Students at Simon Fraser University voted overwhelmingly against the Vietnam war.

The students voted 570-99 for a negotiated withdrawal of U.S. troops. We can expect to see action on this demand very soon and I am sure that the Americans will comply with the wishes of the people.

This triumph of the wishes of the masses leads me to suggest, not too optimistically, I hope, further applications of this method. The evil conditions which could be righted by application of democratic principles are everywhere in our society.

Canada is rent by dangerous splits caused by battling factions. Their differences could be resolved by referring the problem to the

people. The people of Canada could decide on their constitution, their laws, and the system they will live under. Under the pretense of "knowing more than the masses about running a country" our leaders refuse to allow the people to run the country and determine the changes which affect their lives. The leaders of this country pay only lip service to the tenets of true democracy, but, in reality, are afraid of having their ideas defeated by the people.

Democratic ideas are not limited to solving social crimes and evil. Application of these principles can greatly increase the efficiency of society and provide better use of our resources.

With the old system, a committee, or sometimes a single person, would research a problem for several years to determine a

solution. All this drain on society's money and time is not necessary. Indeed an opinion and supposed "solution" has no validity unless approved by the people in true democratic tradition. The problem should be referred to the people in the first place and the committee "middlemen" should be cut out.

It has long been maintained that social realities have no place in scientific fields. The truth is that democratic principles have no limitations and can be applied in all fields. Science is no exception.

A short example should suffice to illustrate my point. Many researchers have spent thousands of hours and millions of dollars solving the problem of the composition of the atom.

This question could be solved with a

great saving in men and material by voting on it. Liberated from these duties, the scientists could spend their time working for the benefit of society instead of their present studies, which often show a lack of concern for the masses.

Furthermore, to simplify arithmetical calculations, the value of π (presently an irrational number about 3.1415926536) could be declared to be exactly three by legal decree if the people so desire. A vote would easily decide this.

I can see no objection to this application of the principles of democracy unless it is the inordinate number of votes required to solve all the problems of the world. I have calculated the number of votes to be around one million plebiscites per day. This number, however, could easily be changed by a vote.