

Ray Turns  
on Gietz



Others Turn  
To Good Old Sex

**INCOMPETENT CRITIQUE**

To The Editor:

Beverly Gietz may someday be great but, as a critic of folk song and minstrelry, she is incompetent. Her critique of the Margaret Turner-Frank Gay Yardbird Suite appearance in last Friday's Gateway is commendable for its honesty. My purpose is not to question her judgment of the artist; in the interests of the art of criticism, however, I wish to point out how lack of knowledge, coupled with a desire to play the role of a critic, can result in something quite the opposite of what a good critique should be.

Our so-called folk singers fall roughly into three categories: the true folk singer who sings only the songs of his particular community; the minstrel, a more or less trained musician, who sings songs of many regions; the highly skilled concert singer using folk songs as a basis for his repertoire. Most of the people we associate with folk song are actually minstrels—Seeger, Odetta, Dobson. Margaret Turner could perhaps be called a combination of minstrel and concert singer.

**URBANITE OF EVANGELIST**

The point is, can one judge the work of these three types of singers by the same standards; can we evaluate the artistry of Hank Snow and Paul Robeson by the same criteria? Miss Gietz seems to want our Margaret, a charming urbanite, to perform like an evangelical gospel singer.

She wants a singer of folk songs to achieve rapport with the audience, immerse them in melody and mood, bring them up singing along (Miss Turner did, by the way), to have intensity and spontaneity, to stress the emotional impact of melody and lyric rather than musical structure. All that? Well, of course, every artist must achieve rapport with his audience, but the ways of doing so are numerous; for example, it might even be done without spontaneity.

Let us consider two "greats": Ewan MacColl slouches into a chair, fixes a disdainful eye upon the crowd, and just sings, straight and "I don't give a damn"; Odetta makes a beautiful theatrical entrance, wins the audience with the warmth of her smile and takes you with her to the rock piles of the prison farms. Yes, they both live their music, but mainly internally. Miss Gietz did not explain what this nebulous quality called showmanship really is—does it mean inner conviction so great that external mannerisms don't matter?

**GREATNESS IS MEANINGLESS**

Hardly, since she hints that Turner and Gay would be more acceptable hidden away in a radio studio so that only their sounds will affect us. And, by the way, how do you separate melody and lyric from structure?

Is not any artist who achieves competence deserving of praise, worthy of being listened to? Greatness? Who can define it? Would a critic not be well advised to try and discover what an artist's expected goal is in any particular performance, judging him on the basis of how well he succeeds in attaining his goal? To measure any artist by a yardstick of greatness is meaningless, of no value as criticism, and can be damaging.

Oh, I forgot to mention that a folk singer, according to Miss Gietz, must be "something of a dramatist". How much? How many plays do you think Miss Turner should have written by now?

Since my purpose really is to help the young critic, I offer these suggestions. Only an authority in a particular field can be a true critic. If you are somewhat less than an authority, show a little humility; you

will be judged as more mature if you do. You might be wise to just state what happened at the concert, in some cases.

Do be critical, of course, and if you feel that a slam must be made, perhaps you could unless you are absolutely sure of your ground, offer it as a problem to be pondered by artist, audience, and reader, for example: "Perhaps it would have been more effective if . . ." In this way, you see, you don't climb out up a limb, such as the one I have just been industriously sawing; and your point can still be made just as effectively.

There is no virtue in criticism for its own sake.

Vern Ray,  
Education 4

Ed NOTE: How would you like a position on our staff, Mr. Ray?

**LIBERAL CONGRATULATIONS**

To The Editor:

I wish to congratulate the Liberal party on its strong stand taken on the issue of public power (despite the open disgust and even resignation of some of their more prominent members).

In adopting this stand they have aligned themselves with the New Democratic Party, which since its inception has advocated public power in this province.

There are a number of questions which are raised by this act, however. Is the Liberal Party willing to follow through with its step to the left? Is it willing to accept the necessity of a cohesive program of democratic social and economic planning?

**WITH LOWERED EARS**

Is it willing to take government action into the transition to an automated economy? Is it willing to take a stand on the pressing international issues which face us today? Or will the Liberals remain in their traditional position—sitting on the fence with their ears to the ground?

Such a position is no doubt good for winning votes, but a political party also has an obligation to lead. And surely this is the case today more than ever.

Let the Liberals speak: if they are willing to take the step to Social Democracy implied in their action, we of the New Democratic Party will welcome them.

But if the issue of public power is merely an attempt to create a progressive image for the old stodgy Liberal party of the past, then their attempt to fool the voters will go no further than the next election.

Robin Hunter  
Chairman  
Campus NDP

Ed. NOTE: (a) The Conservative party in Ontario nationalized power there in 1907. Did it thus align itself with the nonexistent NDP?

(b) The Social Credit party in B.C. nationalized power there last year. Did it thus align itself with the NDP? (You answer that one.)

**CONSERVATIVE CHALLENGE**

Through the Editor,  
To Messrs. Gerald Offet and Dave Parsons.

In reply to your letter of Tuesday, November 20 challenging the Campus Liberal Club and another local organization to a debate.

Because we are discriminating (in taste), we decline to debate in the company of this other organization.

However, we would be most pleased to meet you in forensic display. Since you posed the challenge we feel it equitable and in accord with the Bill of Rights to be able to select the topic.

On behalf of the Campus Liberal Club, I personally challenge the Conservative Club, and/or their staunch supporters-of-late, the Social Credit party, to debate the resolution: Resolved that Prime Minister Diefenbaker should be impeached for malfeasance, misfeasance, and nonfeasance.

You, sirs, may appear individually or, if you feel it necessary, bring a team. The Campus Liberal Club feels that one speaker should be most adequate to affirm the resolution.

The debate will be held in Con Hall on Friday, Nov. 30th at 12:15 p.m.

Sheldon Chumir  
President  
Campus Liberal Club

**MEDICAL SEX**

To The Editor:

I have been following the letters relating to premarital sex quite intently and critically. I find most of them have expressed opinions not based on present medical knowledge, nor on the findings of psychological studies. This is disconcerting.

Three prevalent attitudes seem to stand out, namely:

1. That pregnancy is not a real hazard, but merely the result of ignorance and/or stupidity;
2. That because sex urges arise outside the marriage state, control of



them inevitably leads to irresolvable frustration, and therefore, satisfaction of them is not only desirable and justified, but vital, and;

3. That physical pleasure is the ultimate and supreme goal of sexual intercourse.

These views seem to predominate among the male species, especially view one (probably because males do not become pregnant, therefore the question does not really concern them). This is understandable, but for a man to be indifferent, in my opinion, is inconsiderate and immature. A mature person considers very carefully the possible outcome of his actions.

**HOW EMBARRASSING**

Contraceptives (and this is based on my medical knowledge and medical experience) require time and privacy to ensure their effectiveness, (except the pills available only through a prescription). "Carefully planned premarital sex relations" are more idealistic than realistic. Since many seem to engage, not in planned intercourse, but impulsively, when the urges are brought to the fore, it is quite likely that neither of the pair are equipped with contraceptives unless they are carried around in her purse (and how embarrassing if it were to spill), his coat pocket or glove compartment. Time and privacy may not be available either. Often the possibility of pregnancy is not even considered until the emotions relinquish the upperhand to the intelligence. Even if sex relations were planned, the girl has a varying time to wait before she knows whether or not her efforts

were effective, which might take some of the pleasure out of the act. Married women, who have time and privacy often "get caught" as I have had more than one lady confess to me.

**ACTING ON THE ID**

My views on the second impression have been influenced by analytic reading of articles on both sides of this question, by medical people, and by psychologists. I cannot consider their views immaterial until I have acquired the same amount of knowledge in their field. I have also noticed correlation between their views.

It is my firm belief that sex relations are for mature people who are aware of the potential of their sexual nature and who are in control of their urges. To engage in sexual intercourse merely to relieve sexual tension seems to be acting on the "id" level or by the "pleasure principle" without the use of the reasoning powers. The id (according to Freud) is irrational and is bent on returning the organism to a tension-free state, and is normal in the infant and somewhat in the toddler before he learns bowel control.

Frustration may be inevitable, but again, a mature person who has developed self-awareness will accept his feelings including frustration, and will channel them into socially accepted and healthy activities (sublimation). This will prevent neurosis. The immature person should mature by developing self-control especially in this area, as uncontrolled impulsiveness is likely to be dangerous.

"Does premarital sex harm anyone if it is carefully planned so as to avoid pregnancy and the spread of disease?" My answer is "yes." Perhaps no physical harm results, but psychological trauma may and does. A male would likely say "no", because he can experience satisfaction by mere release of sexual tension.

**APT TO BE THWARTED**

A female, in contrast, apparently requires a conducive atmosphere, one which surrounds her with a feeling of warmth and a sense of well-being. Her satisfaction and fulfillment come from and are dependent upon the giving of herself—physically and emotionally as well as from the release of sexual tension. She has psychological needs which are apt to be thwarted if not understood either by her or her partner, and she may experience disillusionment to the extent she develops frigidity and detrimental attitudes towards the male sex.

Sexual relations are bound to be more mutually rewarding if both enter into them, not for self-satisfaction alone, but for giving of oneself—body, emotions and personality, to the other that he or she may have pleasure and fulfillment.

I am inclined to believe that there are few men who premaritally attempt to understand the psychological needs of a woman when all they want and need is physical pleasure. I think that contemplation of marriage, coupled with love (that illusive word!) improves this situation. Maturity and a sense of responsibility are more apt to be absent in premarital relations than in marriage. Usually, in marriage both partners have a deep respect and understanding of the other, and a concentrated interest in each other's welfare.

**FACULTY MOTIVES**

I am not so opposed to premarital sex as I am to the lack of a sense of responsibility and concern for the other person, and faulty motives which seem (to me) to prevail in premarital sex. Experimentation and satisfaction of the curiosity I consider wrong motives for engaging in

sex at any time. I also realize that marriage is not a "cure-all", and is apt to be a dismal failure if entered into as such.

Marriage also requires maturity. Mature attitudes should be developed before marriage. Two people ought to be able to get to know each other well enough before marriage by frank discussion of this aspect of it, and by developing mutual interests. If mutual interests are more important than sex after marriage, why not before? Young people should learn about themselves and life before sex relations are engaged in, in my opinion, so that both may have more to contribute to the sex relationship.

May I suggest that "Sex on the Campus" by Margaret Mead, a noted anthropologist, in the Redbook, October 1962, be read by those who feel I have, perhaps, "gone in over my head." (She also contributes to the Psych. 382 text.) Her closing statement seems to have the same idea that I have tried to express, that of the need for responsibility.

**BECOME A NATIONAL HERO**

I do not expect introjection of my ideas without the use of reasoning powers, but I am convinced these points are very important. If someone can prove these to be untrue or immaterial, I am willing and open-minded. (I would suggest some research beforehand, and objectively.) If some one knows of a "sure-fire" contraceptive, let the medical profession know. You may become a national hero. I would also not mind some light being shed on the psychological aspects of sex relations from a male viewpoint. I may have represented them unfairly.

Until I have sufficient evidence contrary to what I have stated on the premarital sex question, I must needs remain,

**A Conscientious Objector**

Ed NOTE: You seem to have absorbed quite well the material covered thus far in Psychology 382.

**SHORT OR SWEET**

To The Editor:

What's so good about sex?

Ed Eunuch

**THIS IS NO ANSWER**

To The Editor:

Three cheers for Gateway and Varsity Voices! May I add that sex IS a fascinating subject, so much so that even I an amoral scoundrel, would like to contribute to its discussion.

For the last few weeks, students of both sexes have been sending in their opinions on should we or should we not indulge in premarital sex-play. Needless to say, it has developed into quite a controversy. Yet I cannot see how such a controversy could have any bearing on the "should we's" or the "shouldn't we's".

**NOW SECOND HAND**

I agree fully with Gateway's heading "To Sex or Not to Sex, That is No Question." Whether pre-marital sex is morally or socially right or wrong, how many of you normal, red-blooded male student will refuse it if the opportunity to experiment crosses your path. How about you, "Old Fashioned"? Would you not engage in sex if you had the chance? Therefore what's the use engaging in endless debates on the morality of sex, if we are going to try it anyway?

Futhermore, why shouldn't we engage in sex? It's God-given and richly rewarding. Girls might object with an "I had a pleasant affair with a boy but we broke up, and now nobody will want to marry me because I'm now second-hand." Phooey!

Personally I would much prefer  
(Continued on Page 8)