

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing

editor Ronald Yakimchuk

news editor Miriam McClellan

assistant news

editor Glenn Cheriton

casserole

editor Elaine Verbicky

sports editor Bill Kankewitt

photo editor Chuck Lyall

STAFF THIS ISSUE—In our Rogues Gallery we filed: Laurie Kostek (back again, making things hard for us in the office), R. Jankowski, Judy Griffiths, Ina van Nieuwkerk, Mary Bjornstad, Elizabeth O'Donoghue, Joe Czajkowski, Ken Bailey, Gail "cancelled czech" Evasiuk, Judy (wine not?) Samoil, Beverly Yacey and Alisa Lendrum (alias Trixie and Bubbles, the new sports of the week), The Incredible Lump, Marjibell, Darlene Ford, and Forrest Bard, who negated Dick Gregory for us and a special Hippypappybirthday to Pilk, thank to Chuck for the photos and credits to me, Harvey G. (for modest) Thomgirt for making the whole thing possible.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. 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

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1968

A prof is discontented

George Haggar has a doctorate in political science from Columbia. Throughout the three years he taught at Waterloo Lutheran University, he was an outspoken critic of Western society, and the university system in particular.

It was largely because of the appearance of this article in the Cord Weekly (student newspaper) that his contract was dropped last year. As then administration president Henry Endress said: "George Haggar has made it very evident he is unhappy. He is unsympathetic to the purposes and operations of this institution."

By DR. GEORGE HAGGAR

The fundamental issue facing university faculties in Canada is whether our "intellectuals" will continue to act as sales clerks or begin to act as intellectuals. Doubtless, most of them as "liberal-minded people" consider the question before us irrelevant as a social issue, but significant as an academic exercise in this world of liberal harmony and "fellowship".

The exponents of harmony in this country have of late discovered that students in fact have passions and those untutored minds are people.

What is amazing, however, is that those consumers are raising questions about the quality of the sold products and sometimes the manufacturing skill of the producers. And most irritating of all, is the fact that the students are asking the higher clerks—the administrators—about the conditions of work for the producers, the environment in which they are shopping and above all, the management of the factory system.

As catalysts of the coming revolution, the students are the harbingers and the heralds of a new civilization—a civilization that asserts that man is not a speck in the cosmic dust, nor a chattel to be bargained about, nor a child to be assuaged by a pacifier. They are saying no to dehumanization, no to pleasant platitudes, no to programmed education; they are proclaiming their humanity in a debauched milieu and they know who is responsible for this monstrosity.

In their quest for self-discovery, human commitment and social emancipation, the students have put their seniors on the defensive and the latter have reacted in typical ruling-class manner.

They have either withdrawn into their shells hoping that this "generational gap" is a temporary phenomenon; or, having noticed the mounting tide of the onslaught, they have tried to harness it so as to reinforce the existing order and demonstrate their liberality. Thus, the new "public relations" in the universities, the commissions, the joint committees and the new "fellowship". But all this utilitarian activity and this "humanism" seems to have whetted the appetites of the consumers who are no longer satisfied with "joint partnership" and are seeking the substance of power, not its shadow.

Here, I think, is the crux of the matter. The students have learned here and elsewhere that in fact, the supporters of the status quo have no intention of sharing in the government of the university and do not plan to abdicate or surrender. Moreover, the faculties have become the Girondists in "this best of all possible worlds". And since they do not want any basic change—they merely want to be "in" on the secrets of empire and to achieve this "historic mission"—some of them would like

to have a united front for the students. Though most professors are contemptuous of "student power" they think that the "radicals" are a small but a useful minority whose immense energies could best be channeled to advance professional interests.

Put bluntly, professors have no regard for student radicalism, and have not examined its contents. But they want to use it as an instrument to club the administrators with rather than use it as a means of opening new fields of student-faculty relations or broadening the existing sources of co-operation and communications. This opportunism is being slowly detected by the students, but as accredited clerks and members of the new priesthood, the professors will go on demanding a role commensurate with their functions in the eternal design of the contemporary university, thinking that they can call in the troops if the occasion requires them. Meanwhile they will rely on "reason" to persuade the administration that the "machine" can be operated more productively and more efficiently if they sit in on more non-accountable and non-functioning committees.

To illustrate this principle, let us cite our campus—the best of all possible campuses. Here we merely have an ecological community—a personalized environment of monads linked together by a physical plant and a "benign" administration whose members prepare and distribute the monthly "diet". The faculties protest and they grumble in their "palatial" faculty lounge, and they even talk about "power", but the moment someone has access to power, his information becomes privileged and it cannot be divulged, etc., etc., etc.

The difficulties of the professors are compounded by their lack of collective consciousness as a group and thus their relationships with the students cannot be any more than transactional. For these reasons, the faculties are half-victims, half-accomplices and therefore, half-human beings. And this leads me to say: unless the intellectual replaces the clerk, both the administrator and the teacher will become superfluous clerks in this great private enterprise of ours. Therefore, it follows that the intellectual as the interpreter of the "tradition" must become the author of the tradition, and if he does not, or refuses to, he, like his predecessors, must be consigned to the dustbin of history.

Knowledge is pain and the demands of virtue are onerous and only the great create great deeds. And this epoch is a time of greatness, a time of quest, and a time of love; a time of spring and a time of passions; a time of brotherhood and a time of integrity; a time of choice and a time of authenticity; a time of man becoming man and a time of freedom and her majestic unfolding.

It is a time of revolution!

Campus clubs discriminate

By EVAN GARBER

It is unfortunate that the issue of racial discrimination on campus cannot be discussed more freely in public. Exchanges over the issue erupt briefly and violently. The episode at Friday's SDU, SCM speak-out was no exception. There seems to be an abundance of opinion but a scarcity of reason. Thus, my purpose is to delineate issues and establish guidelines for discussion. While I have in the past been a member of a fraternity, I approach this issue with no interest at stake, save that of fairness and justice.

In order to eliminate emotional overtones, the best way to approach racial discrimination is through the austere pages of the dictionary. The World Book Dictionary defines discrimination as "the act of making or recognizing differences or distinctions." Note that this definition attaches no moral values to the word.

Every club or organization on campus must discriminate (make distinctions) among potential members. This is neither good nor bad. It is necessary. The University of Alberta Mixed Chorus, for example, discriminates according to ability to produce musical sounds. Why? By accepting only those applicants who show talent, the club can maximize its objective of producing fine music.

The idea that membership qualifications should be based upon a club's objectives is important. It is expressed in the following principle.

To the extent that discrimination — through membership qualifications — may enable a club to maximize its ob-

jectives, then such discrimination is necessary and justifiable.

Nothing has been said about racial or religious discrimination. These are particular types of distinctions, based upon race or religion. The principle expressed above implies that not all racial discrimination is evil. As shall be demonstrated there are, indeed, two kinds (referred to as neutral and pernicious).

Discrimination based on race (or religion) which enables a club to achieve its objectives is justifiable. This is called neutral racial discrimination. Racial discrimination which is incompatible with objectives of a club is called pernicious racial discrimination.

Suppose there is a religious club whose objectives are to discuss common beliefs and engage in religious ritual. No one would prevent that club from establishing restrictive membership policies based upon religion. The religious discrimination here is neutral because it is established to permit the club to achieve its objectives.

Virtue is no function of race . . .

More important, one can look at the direction of the discrimination. It is not aimed at eliminating or derogating any particular group, especially a minority group.

On the other hand, many of these organizations arise among minority groups because there may be no other medium through which to develop friendship and express common beliefs and values.

In this sense, it is probable, although by no means necessary, that such organizations develop in response to a closed social structure.

Turn now to the fraternal system. Logically a fraternity is required to discriminate among potential members in order to achieve objectives. Brotherhood (mutual trust from which friendship can grow) is the primary stated objective of a fraternity. Accordingly, a fraternity should establish membership qualifica-

tions based on brotherhood, such as truthfulness, honorableness, courage, humility, and other fine virtues. This is justifiable discrimination.

However, if and when a fraternal order establishes a further qualification of race or religion which is entirely extraneous to its stated objectives, then that organization is guilty of pernicious racial discrimination.

Virtue is no function of race, color, creed, ethnicity or religion. A restrictive "color bar" is therefore entirely inconsistent with the objective of brotherhood and under the terms of this argument is pernicious.

The time has now arrived to clear up what may superficially appear to be an inconsistency in the argument. There is no legal distinction between neutral and pernicious racial discrimination. However, this argument is based upon such a distinction.

Can intelligent minds succeed?

Legislative bodies and courts do not make this distinction because their jurisdiction concerns commercial activities in which goods or services are bought or sold. The objective of a restaurant owner, for example, is to make a profit by selling and serving food to customers. Racial discrimination is incompatible with these objectives. A black man's dollar is the same as a white man's dollar. The need for legislative bodies to make the distinction has not arisen.

Our situation on campus presents us with the complex problem of making this distinction between neutral and pernicious race discrimination. Can intelligent minds rise to the occasion?

Before going on, I may offer a rule of thumb, thus falling prey to the folly in the simplicity of all rules of thumb. That is, ethnic, religious, and racial organizations should be expected to make ethnic, religious and racial distinctions. Others should not.

As the final strand of the argument, suppose that a club which has previously been guilty of committing pernicious

racial discrimination, decides to re-define its objectives so that they are compatible with racially discriminatory membership policies, the latter which become justifiable under the terms of the argument.

Suppose that the new objectives were "white power" in nature. Admittedly pernicious racial discrimination would no longer exist. But this would not discount the validity of the argument.

A new concept must be introduced. Racism is "an attitude or set of attitudes based upon racial superiority." Racism is "an attitude . . ." Discrimination is "the act . . ." The single concept of racial discrimination cannot be used to deal with all the problems arising out of prejudice.

In conclusion one cannot get rid of racism and pernicious racial discrimination in the same manner that one would flush a toilet. But since fraternities, through membership in Intrafraternity Council are under the jurisdiction of the university, it is our duty to disallow such policies on our campus.