The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

Al Scarth editor-in-chief Dan Carroll Joe Czajkowski sports editor ... managing editor ... Peggi Selby, photo editor . Dave Hebditch news editors ... Sid Stephen

STAFF THIS ISSUE—As the din of the meeting on that dark and stormy daily died out and the smoke cleared away, who did we see but Dugesia the Bookworm, Nimble Nimmons Dick (frustrated), Harrold the Kelp-Ketcher, Dan, the joyous son of Jamie, Ginny Bax in the slot-box again, Mobbed Bob Anderson, whom all the nurses are after, Ron Ternoway, whose fault it all is, Jannie Staford-Mayer, Elaine Verbicky, the Curse of Montezuma (close friend of Ron Dutton's). Elsie Ross. Norm Clarke, the five o'clock shadow and yours truer than ever, Harvey G

The Gateway is published daily by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Monday edition-6 p.m. Sunday, Advertising-noon Wednesday prior; for Tuesday edition—6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Thursday prior; for Wednesday edition-6 p.m. Tuesday, Advertising-noon Friday prior; for Thursday edition-6 p.m. Wednesday, Advertising noon Monday prior; for Friday edition—6 p.m. Thursday, Advertising—noon Tuesday prior; Casserole—copy deadline 6 p.m. Monday, Advertising-noon Friday prior. Short Shorts deadline, 3 p.m. day prior to publication. Advertising manager Percy Wickman, 432-4241. Office phones 432-4321, 432-4322 and 432-4329. Circulation—15,000. Circulation manager Brian MacDonald, 432-4321.

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

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1969

SUB committee answers bowlers

As two recent articles in The Gateway have called attention to SUB expansion, I would like to clarify the position of the commission.

The first, referred to the unaesthetic decorum of our food facilities, an issue fully supported by the commission and already under the study of the architect.

The Dinwoodie room was planned as a flexible area to provide both cafeteria and ballroom space at a lower cost to the project. However, the space became usable for both functions but not suitable for either. The proposed expansion suggests the addition of a new ballroom and the conversion of Dinwoodie into a carpeted, more colorful and divided area.

The second, regarding the bowling lanes is a more complicated issue still under the consideration of the commission. As I mentioned to the authors of the letter, no decision would be made until more evidence of the situation was gathered, especially the suggestions of a financial management study just commissioned by council. As much as I sympathize with avid bowlers, there are many aspects to be weighed.

All suggestions of the Expansion Commission are formulated only after considering the total use, trends and needs of facilities in light of enrollment projections and

financial possibilities. No one lobby should take precedence over other student needs

Although minority must be protected so that SUB can offer a variety with services for almost every student, no activity should be excessively subsidized by the majority for a few.

In this specific case, the bowlers are willing to admit that more billiards are required primarily to fill the needs of the lines who wait an hour for a table from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The unfortunate fact remains that the only area which could be serviced from the desk would remove two lanes-creating an either/or dilemma.

If the removal of these two lanes would prove uneconomical and only render the remaining lanes useless, as the bowlers claim—then indeed they have a valid case and the billiard crowd will have to continue waiting in line.

The fact that the proftis margin for billiards far outweighs that of bowling (a profit which is used to finance the construction of other areas in SUB which pay no dividends) is a secondary factor.

Any expansion of SUB must reflect the needs and services required by the campus at large. For that reason, I thank the bowlers for their opinion and invite more student groups or individuals to forward their suggestions to the commission, care of myself.

> Laura Scott Chairman, SUB Expansion

Student apathy . . . again!

I agree with the sentiments of the editorial in The Gateway, Friday, Oct. 3, that lack of student interest in university affairs is deplorable. Furthermore, I would like to suggest that such matters as student indifference and student apathy rather than student power or student parity should be foremost in the minds of our union 'representatives'. How do you represent someone who doesn't care?

The establishment of community spirit and group solidarity among the student body should receive top priority as a concern of the students' council rather than the providing of more and better services or seeing that students get adequate representation on certain committees, important as these things may be.

No student will be interested in

the affairs of the student community unless he can be made to feel that he belongs, that his opinion is important. This will be accomplished only through personal contact. All the advertising in the world will not replace individual personal contact: in-terested individuals who interest other students, who interest others and so on. Granted, this approach demands strategic creativity and hard work, much more than simply debating issues and submitting reports. But the results are more rewarding. Individuals must come

One cannot organize a meeting simply by plastering posters all over the campus and expect people to come. How about some of that 'personalized attentioin'?

> Richard Gerard sci 2

Anthro. professor hits 'smear tactics'

In his Oct. 10 letter responding to Dr. Frucht's criticism (Oct. 6) of Prof. Bentley's views about the introduction to the Birth Control Handbook (Sept. 30), Prof. Her-mansen perhaps intended to provide some humor as well as some enlightenment on India's food problem. If so, he failed dismally in both objectives.

Prof. Hermansen's ill-tempered and malicious attack on Dr. Frucht personally and on the Department of Anthropology (he called it the "Karl Marx Institute of Biased Anthropology") is ridiculous non-sense rather than humor. It is also what one expects from political demagogues rather than scholars.

My colleagues in the department must decide for themselves whether to protest; speaking for myself, I resent the patent falsehood which Prof. Hermansen has spread upon the pages of The Gateway. Dr. Frucht is the sole Marxist in my department, unless, perhaps, I have failed to detect others hiding in our equipment storage room or the lavatory. Regarding Dr. Frucht's Marxist views, Prof. Hermansen should not allow his somewhat overheated imagination to lead him into thinking he has provided Gateway readers with some sen-sational revelation. Dr. Frucht's colleagues and students have known his Marxist theoretical orientation for years, since he has always stated it openly and articulately. What Prof. Hermansen might realize, in his calmer moments, is that his right to personal dislikes and disagreement with ideas does not give him licence to employ crude smear tactics against an individual or his department.

As regards Prof. Hermansen's effort to set us straight on India's and agricultural problems, about all he has made clear and convincing is that he knows nothing of significance on the subject. I think my own modest credentials—about 15 years of steady concern, as a social anthropologist, with Indian society in its structural and historical aspects, plus considerable travel and observation in India-give me a sufficient basis for refuting Prof. Hermansen's naive view. would he, for example, reconcile his optimistic picture of India's progress in feeding its hungry millions with the fact that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi only recently decided to turn the Indian economy sharply in a socialist direction? How would Prof. Hermansen reconcile his own statement about the benefits of technical aid with the analysis and conclusions of economist Prof. Charles Bettleheim of the Sorbonne in his authoritative work, India Independent, or those of United Nations agronomy consultant René Dumont in his book, Lands Alive? I think that Prof. Hermansen would find, if he did the necessary homework, that India's mixed capitalist and quasifeudal rural society, despite foreign technical assistance, is incapable of more than a picayune alleviation, much less a solution, of India's food problem. The funda-mental difficulties are structural: uneconomically small, fragmented, individual land holdings under a system of landlordism, tenancy, share-cropping and usury; poten-tially productive land lying idle

because reclamation and cultivation are inconsistent with profitmaking under that system; other lands given to cash crops for export instead of food production because the former option is very profitable to the owners and fetches hard currency (all too often squandered on imported luxuries which only middle and upper classes can afford). One need not be a Marxian social scientist to perceive and analyze such fundamental problems, though it probably helps. In any event, improved agricultural techniques, better seeds and Bentleyan birth control are not going to mean much until such problems are overcome. The necessary means for overcoming them may well turn out to be drastic and repugnant to comfortably distant in-habitants of intellectual ivory towers; they may, however, give no pause to India's exploited and poverty-stricken peasant majority. For them, the present institutional arrangements are little more than an indefinite sentence to slow

Since Dr. Frucht never said that the USSR or any other communist country has solved its agricultural problems, nor that he approved Stalin's or anyone else's practices in such countries, Prof. Hermansen's tirade on such questions may be dismissed as just another red herring. The final paragraph of his letter implies, however, that one who employs Marxian and methodology in social analysis must favor particular regimes and their policies. The history of the Marxian intellectual movement on several continents over the past half century simply falsifies such a view; Prof. Hermansen might like to add some reading in this con-nection to the homework suggested above.

Ideological labelling and invective will not clearly clarify an understanding of the problems of the Third World. Sound theory and relevant data will. It is to the latter that anthropologists, non-Marxist and Marxist, are trying to contribute.

Charles S. Brant Professor of Anthropology

Schizophrenic bureaucrats

By WINSTON GERELUK

A radical change overtakes scholars who become administrators. There is something inherent in the positions they try to fill which tends to make goats out of

Either this is the case, or else many of the men who have filled these positions have actually been goats to start with.

However, because of President Hayakawa at San Francisco and Claude Bissell at Toronto, it seems that the former position is the

It also helps us explain what happened closer to home to some of our own administrators, e.g., Mardiros (philosophy) and Hirabayashi (sociology). These scholars, and others, have taken administration and the scholars and the scholars. istrative posts only to become the objects of ridicule, hate, scorn, cynical indifference, or, worse yet, simpering obeisance.

Why does this happen to people who really cannot be that much less likeable than the local beer

In direct contradiction to a point in Dr. Wyman's speech, the answer to the above question can be found by analyzing the system rather than the men who fill them.

In order to successfully fill the demands of his position, the university administrator must, to a large extent, cease being a scholar,

and become something else. You see, the university as a large bureaucracy, does not operate with the welfare of its members as its primary goal. Rather, its goal is to achieve (or appear to achieve) maximum efficiency in dispensing with the business at hand, i.e., remaking students into 'useful' cit-izens. The people involved are valuable only insofar as they are means to this end.

Because the welfare of people is not its end, the notion of the university as a human institution must be discarded. And this, in turn, makes the role of the top bureaucrats easier to understand.

It is the administrator's job to see that the ends of the institution are realized. He himself is only of value if he succeeds.

The primary ends of a large

university are not that hard to isolate. They are as follows:

(1) To keep itself in operation. This end is achieved only when the institutional cogs, students, courses, administrators, equipment, secretaries, etc., mesh into a smoothly-running whole. The administrator's job is to act as an engineer. He must detect and weed out all dysfunctional parts, be they noisy students or squeaky air conditioners.

(2) To serve (or appear to serve) a corporate society, mostly the business sector. Towards this end, the administrator must see, for example, that the critical social science departments turn out experts in human manipulation, and the legal department experts in

contract law.
(3) To maintain a good image (usually synonymous with aims 1 and 2). The bother is that the larger and richer the university is, the more it is dependent on a good image to stay on the receiving end of grants and gifts.

However, the above three aims conflict with the traditional aims of a university. The essence of a university is not in its administrative bureaucracy, but in its scholars, professors and students.

Far from fulfilling the aims of the bureaucracy, scholars actually contradict them. As if to spite administrations, scholars have always been interested in conflict rather than smooth efficiency, criticism rather than affirmation of societal ways, and unfortunately mey haven't given a damn for appearances.

As a result, the person filling the top administrative post must resolve this dilemma - should he sacrifice efficiency and the university's image, endangering his own job? Or should he curb the activity of the scholars, arousing their resentment in the process?

It will be interesting to see how Dr. Wyman handles the dilemma he inherited in his pompous installation. Though it seems impossible that he can ever resolve the stu-dents with the bureaucracy, he will enjoy at least two advantages over many who have tried - a sense of humor and an extremely quiet campus.

Bitch away if you voted

"Bitching" about the activities of the students' council is a common pastime for some undergraduates; recent decisions on such matters as the Evergreen and Gold, grants to the Native People's Defence Fund and so forth have come in for their share of criticism in the past weeks.

However, when one considers the fact that less than 20 per cent of these undergraduates exercised their right to vote for students' council representatives in the council by-elections last Friday, it would appear that many students in the faculties of Arts, Education, Science, Commerce and Engineering have "opted out" of their responsibilities as well as their right to complain about council.

The standard reply is the one that goes "none of the candidates represented my views." The an-swer is simply "then why didn't you run yourself?" The easy way out is the apathetic way out: don't vote, then sit around and complain about the way "those guys" are "running things."

How about this: the next time you hear a bitch about council, ask to see the bitcher's (bitchee's?) students' union membership card. If it's punched, that is if he has voted, listen to him even if you disagree with him. If he hasn't voted, tell him to get down off his soap box.

Sid Stephen arts 2