



## letters

### still Worth comment

On reading the Gateway's pathetic attempts at commenting on the Worth Report, I'd like to know just how and why the commentators were picked. The writers weakly criticized the style of the Report, but commended it for its apparently "positive" nature.

Is it a coincidence that this line coincides precisely with the type of commentary that the editor, Terri Jackson, and the news editor, Candace Savage, agreed in August (in my hearing) should be presented?

From this experience I can only conclude that the articles which are selected to appear in Gateway reflect the personal values and attitudes of the editor and news editor, no matter whose name appears as a writer. From now on I will read the Gateway with this understanding.

Doug Mustard  
Grad Studies

*The articles in question were commissioned on the basis that one would support, the other criticize the Worth Commission report. We had no prior knowledge of the exact arguments the writers would make.*

*Mustard does not accurately describe what either of us think about the report or what we thought of it in August. Neither is his assessment of the two articles particularly perceptive. He must read as inattentively as he eavesdrops.*

*If Mustard reads the Gateway with this understanding, he will be deceiving himself.*

CS

### term papers

I have noticed, in several recent Gateway issues, an advertisement placed by "Termpaper Research", a company operating out of Los Angeles. The advertisement offers a mail order catalogue of 2,300 quality term papers and claims "we also write custom made papers". This is an offer which would make a mockery of term assignments in some courses at this University. It seems to me to be a clear invitation to fraudulent behavior and the Gateway, by running the advertisement, appears to be in support of it. Do you intend this?

D.B. Scott,  
University Ombudsman

### legitimate left?

The current debate between the Poundmaker and the Gateway has been interpreted as a personal feud between Terri Jackson, Gateway editor, and the ex-Gateway, now Poundmaker staff.

Rather, it has to be interpreted in light of a growing tendency to authoritarianism in student government.

When student council approved Terri Jackson as editor of the Gateway over the wishes of the majority of the Gateway staff, they asserted the right of the student council to control the functioning of the newspaper on campus. An unfortunate precedent for student newspapers generally, and one which means this year's Gateway staff can't guarantee that they won't be in the position of last year's Gateway staff next year.

Presumably, it is because Canadian University Press sees the danger in the attempt of a student union to control the student press that it was forced to expell the Gateway, not because of any antipathy to Terri Jackson. The danger lies in having the press controlled by the group in power (whatever small powers student governments have) rather than allowing the press to be self-determining.

Even though Terri Jackson (and the Gateway staff) is clearly not in the pocket of the Student Council, the fact that she was appointed over the wishes of the former Gateway staff creates a situation where it will be progressively easier for the student council (and executive) to dominate the internal workings of the paper.

Since 1969, when the student movement in Canada was severely damaged with the death of the Canadian Union of Students, radical students have gravitated towards student papers. Because of that phenomenon, student councils, moving to the right in general, have tried to assert control over the student press. The Poundmaker/Gateway controversy has to be understood from this perspective, and interpreted in this way, students have no alternative except to support Poundmaker. Not however because Terri Jackson or the Gateway staff are odious, but because the right of a student paper to determine its copy, editors, and policy must be asserted.

Sharon Stevenson Arts

### Flynn cont.

*Note: In the Gateway of September 22, an entire page of a letter from Peter Flynn, secretary of the GSA, was inadvertently overlooked by a typesetter. With apologies for the error, we are reprinting here the final part of the letter with the missing page included.*

3. I remain personally most concerned that the skill or lack of skill of GSA executive not confuse the dispute between GSA and SU. Graduate Students are being forced to buy a building they neither own nor control, and to pay for services they can't control or influence.

how little control graduate students have over the Students' Union building for their \$12,000 per year capital payment was revealed this spring. The Students' Union Executive (not

council) arbitrarily set terms of \$2000 per month for two 8 by 10 foot offices previously given to GSA for a token of \$1 per year. The fact that SU executive magnanimously quartered the rent to a rate competitive to the real world is irrelevant. What \$12,000 a year has brought graduate students is the guaranteed arbitrariness of a passel of young-executives-to-be.

SU services are equally ludicrous. Frankly, we object to paying for Gerry Riskin's gold embossed stationery, for his "executive" remote speaker phone, especially at a time when valid programs are chopped. We resent paying for the SU executive to change their office curtains annually for their expense account luncheons at the Faculty Club. These issues are not comical. We have yet to find a public or private official, other than Mr. Riskin, who needs gold embossing for such crucial tasks as finding a parking spot. The same people who found it necessary to close the art gallery managed to expand their expense accounts this summer. How many pictures went into drinking lunches at the Faculty Club, with the tab picked up by student fees?

During SU's disaster budget debate (but no disaster for the young tyros) SU never had the courtesy to ask the opinion of graduate students who pay over \$8000 a year for services. The undergraduates indeed, as Mr. Riskin points out, pay more than graduates, for which they buy a vote. Graduate students have absolutely no vote and no say in SU services. GSA has never indicated its unwillingness to contribute for services graduate students use, such as Gateway. But we will not give a blank check to an apparently unlimited ego trip, we want to know what we buy from SU.

All of these points have been discussed at length with SU executive members. Three times GSA presented terms for amicable settlement of our differences-three times Mr. Riskin promised acceptance or counter-offer. One counter-offer - "Pay your fees and talk to us in September" - was received. The other two must be lying about somewhere on gold embossed stationery.

Both GSA executive and council remain anxious to seriously negotiate grievances and end a divisive rift between natural allies. But we have no intention of being a captive source of income for philistines launching careers, nor will we fund a building from which we are or can be summarily ejected. GSA will continue to fight to return the \$10 to graduate students unless and until the problems with SU are ironed out.

I close with two requests. First, I ask SU to seriously talk to graduate students about the problems between us. Let us bury the acrimony, resolve our grievances, and work together in the many areas where cooperation would benefit us. Second, I ask graduate students to separate the nature of the fee issue from your judgement of the competence of the GSA executive. While our skill is open to question, I feel the gouging of graduate students by SU executive is not.

Peter C. Flynn Secretary,  
GraduateStudents Association

# counterpoint

## personality posters

Dear Student Council,

*Thanks ever so much for the tremendous posters. Indeed there were many of us who didn't know what all of you wonderful people looked like.*

*The way you solved this problem is no less than ingenious. Imagine posters! Someone less imaginative probably would have gone to the Gateway and had names and pictures printed there. Sure, it would have cost less but the pictures would have been nowhere near as impressive.*

*For years to come you will be able to show those posters to your friends with pride.*

*I am a little reluctant to report that someone suggested to me that council was only doing this because they were on an ego trip.*

*Well, I couldn't entertain such a thought for a moment so I pointed out that you only had a thousand printed which wasn't even enough for all the students.*

*He said you never intended all the students to have one but you were planning to display them around campus in which case you had printed 900 too many.*

*I know very well that you have nothing but the best interests of the students at heart so I explained to this person of the slanderous intentions that Saffron Shandro proposed this in council so that students could become more familiar with the people that serve them.*

*He said "Posters with council members pictures on them only serve to put council reps on a pedestal far out of the reach of the average students and furthermore he proposal in council stated that, an information sheet be prepared and would contain phone numbers, and addresses and a brief history of each member, not just picutres of the big five."*

*Do you know what Riskin looks like? I asked.*

*"Yes, I was here last year and saw pictures in the gateway during the election."*

*Then I started to get angry. I told this dummy how people can change and that Riskin's hair was longer and that Spragins had grown a mustache.*

*"People sure do change," he replied, "and we should have two pictures of Riskin so we can see both of his faces at once."*

*Now I was furious and I said, "Oh yeah?"*

*Not satisfied that the good name of Riskin had been tarnished he went on to say "Riskin purchased his own letter head embossed in gold at a cost of \$139.11 and council approved this poster at a cost of \$240.00 for a total \$379.11. Riskin is an ass and the council is doing a lousy job because they have already wasted \$379.11 and we've only been back to class two weeks."*

*By now I was so angry I couldn't even speak to defend you so please respond and let this guy know what the truth is.*

*Sincerely,*

*George W. Mantor*

*I've often wondered what would happen, if an individual, or group of individuals would suddenly start greeting complete strangers (picture this in the Central Academic Building), showing an interest in these strangers, and leaving themselves completely vulnerable to complete strangers. The outcome is obvious, of course. These poor delirious fools would be cut to ribbons.*

*I have a friend, or in this case had a friend, who perfectly illustrates why the outcome of such an encounter is pre-ordained. Harry (of course, a fictitious name) is one of these poor, desperate people who hates himself. When I say that Harry hates himself, I don't mean that he undergoes the periodic spans of low self esteem so familiar to us all, but rather that he has objectively, so he thinks, examined his life and found nothing of value in it.*

*Poor Harry. Like everybody else, he role plays, but unlike a lot of people, he also confuses the role with his essential self, which makes his role playing essentially a form of self-torture. For example, Harry will embark upon his "hip" trip, and if the signs are right, will be successfully at home in it for even up to three months. He will wear a head-band, drink yaro tea, eat granola, and walk around looking sarcastic. But inevitably, holes start popping up in his performance. The first sign that he is starting to make himself feel like an ass is that he becomes very hard on his friends, usually attempting to castrate them for those things which he is making himself feel like as ass about. The headband will go, and he'll begin making sarcastic cracks about headbands. Eventually, it gets to the point where he makes sarcastic cracks about sarcasm. At this point, the incongruity of the whole situation hits him, and Harry goes into temporary seclusion to regroup his energies, emerging in a few weeks in a different role.*

*Again, Poor Harry. He has yet to learn that there is something essentially human in all of us, and although we may not be able to define it, it is this essence which makes us basically good. It requires a monumental act of faith, but, as in Harry's case, life is unbearable without it. After this Act of Faith in ourselves is achieved, it becomes easy to see the role-playing is just a matter of social convenience, and not, as Harry believes, a denial of "truth".*

*And this, incidentally, is why the poor vulnerable fools that this piece opened with would be cut to ribbons: simply because there is enough self hate in all of us to force us to cling to our roles beyond the necessities of a social vehicle, and hiding behind our roles, we transfer our hate to others. Because you see, people never really hate others. They simply hate themselves.*

*Joe Woodard*