



Page

nb

on page five we have letters on chocolate bars, the uab fees, married students housing, old buildings, and students' council. if you are mad about anything, or happy with anything, write a letter to the gateway, too.

letters

take action

After much soul-searching thought and consideration I have come to the decision that it is my moral obligation to reveal to all at the university certain facts for their enlightenment. Along with these facts I offer some humble suggestions which concerned people may be moved to act on or improve.

The first fact is good news. There is good hot chocolate available here. It is sold in the Tory common room and has not only the dubious distinction of being superior to any available elsewhere on campus, but it is almost enjoyable to drink.

What action should you take? Obviously ignore all other sources, brave the somewhat disagreeable outside conditions (which are but a poor imitation of those in the arts building basement) and head for Tory when you want a hot drink.

The other fact I must announce is a bad thing. How many of you realize that since the beginning of the term there has never once been a time when more than two machines carried Turkish Delight chocolate bars at one time? This is the truth.

Rather than mourning long over this new development however, action is needed. Something more drastic than simple patronage of these machines with bars is required.

Ideas which come immediately to mind are fence-painting slogans such as "Turkish Delight in Every Machine" and staging a march on Students Days for Protest.

We might even go a little further by having a huge Berkeley-type sit-in until our demands were met. Whatever action is taken, we must not be forced from our position by promises of negotiation but fight until our demands are fully met.

These then are the facts and my suggestions. The action, students, must be yours.

jim gurnett
arts 1

married students

The married students housing has once again been delayed.

Are the planners waiting for us to be finished university? We need the residences now, not in 1975 and at the rate it is moving, that is when they will start.

The planners are quibbling over the price. What about the Marshall Tory building or even just the furnishings for it?

Is the university prejudiced that they would build single residences but not any for married students?

We do not want luxury homes, just adequate ones. How much of this fantastic price is going to the middle men?

If low rental agencies can offer us a home with three bedrooms and a full basement for \$83, I feel U of A should be able to come at least close to that.

Does this 25 per cent increase cover the necessities, or intercom system, his and her bath tubs, silk drapes, and built-in stereos?

I am hoping this letter will bring a reply as to why there has been delay and delay and delay. I have been waiting three years for the promised housing project.

Mrs. L. G. Blake

subsidy endorsed

Louis F. Helbig should definitely look a little beyond the end of his unscratched nose before he spouts off about the unfairness of the Students Union consideration for increasing the grad students' subsidy to the UAB.

Surely this grad student has learned by now a few things regarding the give and take necessary to mold a student body into a unit. Has he no pride nor interest in his fellow students?

How can this grad student consciously criticize the compulsory subsidy of \$7 for UAB when others are subsidizing his stay here at university and are not making malicious gestures about it? It should be suggested to Helbig and others who share his views, that they try paying their own tuition and other expenses entirely, then perhaps they would appreciate the concept of subsidies.

My endorsement of the subsidy however, does not extend to Dr. Van Vliet's Empire. Van Vliet has done nothing that was directed toward increasing the man's enjoyment as can be verified by the extremely low attendance at WCIAA games here in Edmonton. The sports semi-enthusiasts should open their eyes and see what empire building has done to our sports enjoyment. The responsibility for the (for lack of a better term) "apathy" lies not on the students but in the result of Van Vliet's policies alone. He has even disbanded the junior bear squad so that his road trips would not be

trimmed in order to stay near the limit of the UAB budget.

That is Dr. Van Vliet's real error and the damper that has squelched the fans' support. What he should be doing is so obvious that I am inclined to believe that his views are more limited than Helbig's.

Since the students generally are reluctant to pay a larger fee to the UAB, thus limiting the budget, the road trips should be reduced to a couple round robin tournaments and the participation at home increased. This would result in a dramatic increase in the attendance at home games and would alleviate the need for a larger subsidy.

As the Empire of Van Vliet stands now, there is no justification for increasing the fees. However giving a more equitable distribution of time to all to use the facilities would justify an increase.

g. ron liivam
grad studies

old buildings

I was sorry to read in The Gateway that I had said the old buildings should be remodeled not torn down. I said I had not heard so I could not give any information. I hope it will be corrected.

Mrs. Reg Lister

sycophants

With regard to your editorial in The Gateway of Dec. 2 which described Marilyn Pilkington, Glenn Sinclair and myself as "sycophants", I wish to submit the following pertinent facts:

1. A great deal of time is spent by the executive in the formulation of policy. Changes are often made in suggested policy decisions in order that such decisions will be acceptable to all members of the executive.

2. Not all policy decisions are initiated by Branny Schepanovich. Many of these decisions have been the work of other members of the executive or the members of the students' council.

I trust this will clarify the reasons for the apparent unanimity within the executive.

secretary treasurer
al anderson

you know who will suffer

I've received the Canadian Association of University Teachers report on the Murray-Williamson tenure dispute. May I, from this distance, make a few observations about the committee's findings and report.

I resigned over the failure to reinstate the two men unconditionally, and my position was not upheld, it would seem, by the CAUT. The reason appears to be that the committee feels that because the university administration has more power than individual members, injustices must be allowed to go relatively unmitigated.

But the report clearly reveals disapproval of the present documents concerning tenure qualifications, of the structure of the philosophy dept., of the conduct of the tenure meetings, of the administration's failure to state in writing (to the two men) clear reasons for tenure denial.

Those are all major points we fought last year's dispute about.

The report upholds the academic competence of both men, a point fought over perhaps more bloodily than any other, last year.

Where is U of A now? Where does it stand? The academic world has been informed that U of A is in a mess, and that injustice to staff members is bound to happen under existing conditions. That is not very cheerful advertising.

What's to be done? Those of us who care deeply about the quality of the Canadian community and the future of the Canadian university generally can only see two alternatives.

We shall have bloody, demoralizing, unnecessary battles, year after year, battles that will hurt the student more than anyone else (and who in the present situation really cares about the students?).

Or we will have a movement towards democratization that will hold lively men, contain "disruptive influences", and allow the university to be the many-faceted, stimulating place it always is at its best.

The CAUT report regrets much of the "unfortunate publicity" accorded the Murray-Williamson dispute. I do too. From both sides of the fence.

But in a free society men insist upon seeking public scrutiny of matters involving principles that are important to the life of the community and the nation. And it is quite proper they should do so, no matter whose nose is put out of joint.

U of A is going to suffer in reputation and in its ability to get excellent staff. And it will have more trouble if present conditions prevail.

In particular, if the university wishes to show the general academic community that it has learned from the CAUT report (written by representatives of nine universities), it will begin democratization now, beginning in the philosophy department.

Moreover, since the academic competence of the two men in question has been generously upheld by the CAUT, I believe that Murray and Williamson should be offered appointments without definite term.

If they are not, the university will be admitting it is afraid of them. That is what I can't understand. Because it is always only unjust power that is afraid of individual men.

And I'm sure the administration of U of A neither thinks of itself nor intends to be an unjust power. But if it is, and the CAUT report seems to confirm that it is, the word will be around Canada like wildfire.

Who will suffer? Not me, now. Not the president. Not the members of the staff association holding office. You know who will suffer. Every student at the university and every faculty member who wants to make it a lively, stimulating place to be.

robin mathews
formerly of the dept of english

