

Ah yes. There you are. And, now, due to my revised calculations, I now predict:

Nov 13 1977: an asteroid will hit Europe, destroying the Common Market Countries.

March 17 1978: The US surrenders to the Soviet Union.

May 23 1983: The end of the world!

(of course these three predictions are just a joke. But, my method of fortelling your fortune with dice is not a joke. It is an effective and accurate tool in divining the future!)

John Savard
Science 2

Savard

John Savard, I observe, has written yet another letter and I find I can no longer stand by and ignore the totally asinine, opinionated drivel he continues to submit. I fail to understand why the *Gateway* stoops so low as to include letters of such caliber when the space could be used to bring something of greater importance to the attention of its readers. Perform a public service, please tell Savard to stop embarrassing himself. He is living proof that it is not absolutely necessary that you be able to think intelligently to be a success at University.

M. (John) Sitter
Science 3

Mr. Savard has as much right as you do to express his opinion on our letters page.

S.D.

I think that it is time to reply to two things said about my letters.

1) I don't accuse the *Gateway* of discriminating against science students. All I meant was that because of our harder and heavier programs, we cannot come.

2) I didn't mean that Mr. Cariou or anyone else had a vise-like grip on the *Poundmaker*. I meant that, even if they aren't Communists, most of the *Poundmaker* staffers are to the left of the *Gateway*, at least, and by some wide margin. Is that an unfair accusation?

Additional Note: There is a word such as "diatribe". Try a dictionary instead of a Thesaurus. It means an extreme raging polemic which is without sense. That describes Cariou's letter (the first one) better than the *Gateway's* editorial.

John Savard
Science 2

In reply to John Savard's letter which appeared in the January 19 *Gateway*, I disagree with most of his points. Mr. Savard's first point is that our economy is sure to suffer if we do not export more and cheaper oil to the United States. On the short term this might be beneficial, however this would have three future results. Firstly, it would allow the Americans to put their products on the world market at lower prices, causing greater competition to Canadian export goods. Also, it would cause higher taxes, especially in Alberta. Thirdly, it would be disastrous in the long run; the United States may be able to purchase oil with manufactured goods, but when our oil runs out, Alberta is not heavily enough industrialized to be able to do the same.

Oil is the one thing which Canada can use to join the world's industrialized nations, and become more than hewers of wood and drawers of water. In fact, cheaper oil to the United States would now simply be giving in to the American Senate's threat of retribution, to be visited upon those nations which have recently raised oil prices.

Mr. Savard in his letter also said that he felt there was a disproportionate number of arts

students working on the *Gateway* due to their easier schedules. Perhaps Mr. Savard's "heavier schedule" has interfered with his thinking processes. A large number of arts students on the *Gateway* staff is an expected result. Those who wish to make journalism their career, are usually English majors, and what better way to get related experience then by writing? The phrase "Science Students heavier schedules" is the kind of all inclusive statement which only shows Mr. Savard's ignorance. Maybe all the science students are writing for the *Poundmaker*.

In the same letter, he makes the statement, "While as an Honours Physics student, I cannot agree with them."

What does this mean? Does it mean that all honors physics students will share his views on this point, or is it that his disagreement is a scientifically variable result? I am an Honours Physics student, does this also mean that I disagree in the same manner?

Sincerely
Richard Adler
Science 2

Cariou

Dear Mr. Cariou,

There were a few points made in your rebuttal to Carl Kuhnke's editorial that I would like to put in a different perspective.

Your reference to Kuhnke's 'declaration of a class war' was as much an overreaction to the situation as was his editorial.

That strike was a load of crap from start to finish. Your collective view seems to be that whenever and wherever a strike occurs, the management side has to be wrong and the workers are necessarily in the right.

You berate Kuhnke for his "arrogance and class hatred" and blissfully put out the same sort of image yourself.

Just think who got the screws put to them in that strike. Was it the city? No way...they saved money by not having the buses on the road.

How about the bus drivers? If you are naive enough to swallow any line about their hardship and suffering you haven't looked into anything. Most of the striking bus workers found alternate jobs for the duration driving cabs and so on. It isn't too tough to find work around Christmas, particularly short term stuff.

The people who took it on the nose as a result of this squabble were the older people, poor people, and, if one is to judge by the number of accidents, the ones who don't usually drive in winter.

Your estimation of the bus drivers fighting a good strike is ridiculous.

You suggested that Kuhnke could benefit from involvement in a strike from a worker's side of the fence. It would obviously wouldn't hurt you either.

I worked construction for a few years and was in a position to see first hand how your bleeding lily-white unions protect worker's rights.

The first union I belonged to negotiates contracts in a very pretty way. They manage to get great salary increases for the men every time they go to the table and also do a very neat job of securing their own positions.

The last pay rise on a contract is always just enough to judge the man into another tax bracket so that his paycheck is affected to the tune of about \$25 or so per week to the bad. Naturally the men want to get back the money that they have lost by striking again.

I don't know for sure, but the bus drivers contract probably contains a similar provision.

Whatever the raise they get, the effects are always the same - prices around the city are jacked up and those on fixed incomes get screwed.

In that strike, both the bus drivers and the city behaved in a way that showed just how much they care about the people they supposedly serve. Both sides exhibited greed and obstinacy to the nth degree and neither side should be vindicated on the basis of your politics or anyone else's.

Why don't you climb down out of your ivory tower and live a little Mr. Cariou? Your world view reflects your negligible experience and it is the readers of this paper who reap the benefits of your ignorance every time you write.

Thanks for nothing. Also, if you were not running on a Communist slate, why didn't you have the guts to run and prove it? Hiding behind the flimsy excuse that you gave is nothing but a display of cowardice.

You said that we weren't ready for the kind of government that you would give us and I hope that we never are.

Yours
Paul Cadogan

Bible

In the Jan. 24 *Gateway* was a letter by Miles Johnson stating the danger of knowledge without wisdom, and asking where wisdom could be found. In the Bible, from Proverbs 1:7 (Living Bible), is the answer. "How does a man become wise? The first step is to trust and reverence the Lord!"

Bob Goethe
Arts 3

Chariots of the Gods?

It was on January 24 that I first became aware that the Students Union would be showing the controversial film, *Chariots of the Gods?* I was immensely impressed the first time I had seen this definitive work, a few years ago on television, and eagerly looked forward to seeing it again. Not only was the film being offered, but also a discussion by four University professors on the validity of Erich von Daniken's theories. This was something I wasn't going to miss!

Then came the momentous evening. I was hoping to see the entire film before the world was due to come to an end, sometime before the witching hour. (Remember, forty days plus forty days make eighty days). Apparently there was not an empty seat in the SUB theater; the free admission must have attracted many people who thought the movie was good for a few laughs. Though von Daniken's proposals were excellently expounded, the film was marred by the childlike attitude of the audience. At one point the narrator mentioned that certain constructions of the ancient Greeks were perhaps once used as launch pads for extraterrestrial vehicles. The response from the audience was a few chuckles. So some people think this idea ridiculous, eh? Maybe it is. Later, we learn that the height of the great pyramid of Cheops, when multiplied by a billion, approximately equals one astronomical unit. (Laughter again). Coincidence? Is it also coincidence that the area of the base of the pyramid, divided by twice its height, equals phi? (more laughter). Finally, the narrator suggests that a strange design is probably a drawing of a tool used by space visitors. The resulting laughter was entirely unwarranted.

Then came the discussion. Professor Ruth Gruhn, an anthropologist and archaeologist, began by showing slides. She attempted to prove that numerous rock paintings and sculptures were not of space

visitors. One slide showed that the supposed alien was "evidently a man", with his anatomical features fully exposed. However, either she did not notice (unlikely), or else did not want to notice, and therefore did not explain, two large protuberances in the shoulders of the creature. Is this what ancient man looked like, or is this not a drawing of a man? Another slide showed what a renowned Russian scientist considers to be a sculpture of an extraterrestrial wearing a space suit. The scientist points out various dials, gauges, etc., which are standard equipment on a space suit. Dr. Gruhn, however, points to two large bulges on the front of the statue and mentions that these bulges are "normal female equipment". What she fails to explain to the audience is the nature of the statues hands. Did ancient females have claw-like hands? Why would someone make a sculpture of a short, fat woman? Or is this not a woman, but a robot, or an alien from a planet where the gravity is much greater than earth's? Why, Dr. Gruhn, did you not explain any of this?

Dr. Nyland, physicist, was next. As a second year physics student, I can only say that I was disappointed with his talk also. He stated that the ancient Egyptians actually built the pyramids by themselves, using the simplest of machines, the pulley and the lever. Absurd! As von Daniken states, it would have taken several hundreds of years and several hundreds of thousands of men to complete the great pyramid of Cheops. What did they use for levers, the palm trees that grew nearby? Unlikely, for they depended on these trees for food and it is doubtful that they would destroy such an important necessity for the sake of building some pyramids. Also, why did they not build the pyramids closer to the rock quarries instead of transporting the huge blocks across hundreds of miles of desert to a point exactly where a meridian running through the pyramids divide continents and oceans into two exactly equal halves? Coincidence?

Dr. Cahill, professor of religious studies, obviously believes everything that the Bible has to say. But can we really accept what the Bible says as being true? At the time when the Biblical stories were being developed (more likely due to visits from space beings and not to any omnipotent being and his angels) the people would have surely reacted to the landing of a space vehicle and to the emergence of its occupants as the landing of a heavenly chariot and its gods. (Recall from the movie what happened in World War II when the allied forces set up air bases on certain Pacific Islands. The natives built straw and wood airplanes in the hope of beckoning them back, once they had left). Orally these stories got around, became changed, and when finally put into print were not at all what had really occurred. Through the course of history numerous translations of the Bible resulted

in further changes of the stories, so that the Bible one reads today is misleading, and not an actual account of what did happen. Through two millenia of changes, we are led to believe that there really is an all-powerful, all-knowing God. The Bible says: Thou shalt not kill, and this is supposed to be one of God's ten supreme laws. If God wanted us not to kill, why then does He do so when He destroys the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorah? He tells his subjects one thing, yet does the opposite. By this murderous act, God Himself has committed the greatest sin of all. And He wants the people to respect Him? Why does God, inherent in everything, need a radio in order to contact his people? Why was it that no one was allowed to look at His face, because it was a non-human face, of an astronaut from some far-off planet?

Dr. Ahmed, geneticist, said that man could not mate with the primates. What has this to do with astronauts coming from a distant solar system? If they were more or less human, and the chances are good that life something like ours exists (existed?) elsewhere, then they would have no trouble mating with the people of a few thousand years ago, since at that time humans were long past the apeman stage of evolution (that is, if you believe in evolution from the primates and not this ridiculous story of God making man out of clay). The ancient legends are full of stories of inhabitants that were half-god and half-human.

In summarizing the oratory of the guest speakers it would seem to me that the only thing they said went something like this: von Daniken's proposals are nonsense. This they repeated over and over yet none of the panelists could give any concrete reason why von Daniken is so wrong! There is not one iota of proof that anything resembling a God (in the religious aspect) exists, but there is a plethora of information arguing in favor of extraterrestrial visitation long ago and the subsequent idolization of these beings as gods. (Read *Chariots of the Gods?* and *Gods From Outer Space*, both by Erich von Daniken). Why did the panelists mock von Daniken's theories and only give extremely weak and ridiculous proofs in opposing them? Indeed, why do so many people find it hard to accept (partially, at least) these revolutionary new ideas? Do they fear to learn that there might possibly be far more superior intelligences in the universe and that we could be their children and not, as for ages it has been surmised, the children of God? Do they secretly fear the attack and abolishment of all existing religious and social mores that have for so long formed the basis of our civilization? Do they want to live forever in a false world of illusions, enclosed forever in a sphere of fabrications, a world of ignoble taboos and superstitions? Will we ever fully learn the answer to: was God an astronaut?

John Czuroski
Science 2

The Gateway

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. It is published by the Students Union twice weekly during the winter session on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Contents are the responsibility of the editor, opinions are those of the person expressing them. Letters to the editor on any subject are welcome, but must be signed. Please keep them short, letters should not exceed 200 words. Deadlines for submitting copy are 2 P.M. Mondays and Wednesdays. Main offices are located in Room 282, S.U.B. Phone 432-5168, 432-5750 or 432-5178. Circulation 18,500 Subscription \$5 annually

editor-in-chief Allyn Cadogan
managing editor Carl Kuhnke
news Satya Das photography Doug Moore
advertising Lorne Holladay arts Walter Plinge
production Scott Partridge sports Paul Cadogan

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Bonnie Barnes, Alan Bell, Peter Best, Rick Blak, Gary Draper, Kimball Day, Harold Kuckertz Jr, Greg Neiman, Margriet Tilroe, Brian Tucker, Garry West, Cathy Zlatnik, Barry Zuckerman.