



ASA more unifying for faculty by "legitimizing" complaints

Perhaps people are right in assuming that ASA has undertaken a role too large for itself—that it tends to be divisive rather than unifying. In my opinion however, I feel that I will have a greater opportunity to voice a complaint and perhaps see conditions changed by being a part of ASA rather than asking students' council to do

something for me. If faculties were to form individual unions and students' union serve as a "union of unions," specialized problems could perhaps be handled more effectively.

I suggest that students' council could serve more effectively as a co-ordinator for individual faculty unions rather than having to handle all the diverse problems itself.

It appears to me that students' council as it is now, is more concerned with liberating me as a woman—rather than as a student. But I'm concerned with things like curriculum, courses, classroom size, and the value of my BA.

If a particular individual has an opinion or complaint then he is responsible for doing something about it himself. I feel that ASA is giving me a chance to do something by myself for myself. Association membership "legitimizes" those complaints that individuals have in common. Individuals can work together on a common problem to initiate a solution. Another arts man may protest the same thing as myself, e.g., 500 students in a sociology class. I doubt that a commerce student would share my complaint.

At the present time, there exists a core of "sweat" workers or loosely termed "executive" in ASA. They are attempting to find ways of arriving at solutions for their common complaints. A larger group is asking "But what is the purpose of ASA?" If the "executive" puts forth concrete proposals they will be criticized for being a bureaucracy—attempting to make the decisions for all. It is fine to be representative—but can we really be representative of anyone but ourselves. If individuals want purpose they have to come up with and understand it themselves. It will take many "BS" sessions before concrete proposals can be made reliably or effectively. If students don't want other students making decisions for them, they must participate themselves.

Wake-up people! If you're spoon-fed you'll complain because someone is making decisions for you. If you're not—will you shrug your shoulders and accept what is even if you're not in complete agreement, because it's too much effort to participate in your own behalf? Or will you support ASA so it can support you?
Gaye Abrey
arts 2

Japanese student requests penpals

I am at present a student at Kansai Junior College of Foreign Language. I'd like to have a pen pal in your university. Do you have a friend who wants to correspond with a Japanese girl? Thank you very much.

Setsuko Okada, 19 years
13 Shimizu-cho
Matsubara City
Osaka, Japan

This is Page Fourum — Five

Vice-president agrees with censor—Gateway cartoon not "in good taste"

Your letter of Nov. 18, 1969 addressed to me states only, "This is the cartoon censored from Friday, Nov. 14 Gateway by Mr. Grant," but I understand from our phone conversation that you wish to consider an appeal from Mr. Grant's decision.

Before dealing with the specific issue of the cartoon I wish to register a vigorous objection to your continued use of the word "cen-

sor" in connection with Mr. Grant's decision in this matter. I assure you that this is not a semantic quibble; it is an important matter of principle. To censor is to prohibit a person from publishing something; this the university has not done. What we have done is to exercise our right as printer to refuse to print something with our facilities. Thus, I must insist that the university

(and Mr. Grant, acting in his capacity as an officer of the university) has not censored The Gateway. I think it is important that you and your staff recognize this distinction.

The university's Department of Printing Services has, at the request of the students' union, printed The Gateway for several years at cost. We are willing to continue to do this, but only if The Gateway is willing to meet reasonable standards in the matter which we are requested to print. We are not willing to print anything and everything which you submit. In particular, we are not willing to print items which violate accepted standards of good taste in a newspaper. This is our policy. If you find it objectionable you should take your material elsewhere for printing.

I concur in Mr. Grant's view that the cartoon which you sent to me is in poor taste, and is not acceptable for inclusion in any publication which is to be printed by the university's Department of Printing Services. In my view, to use the services of the university to print material of this type would be to demean the university.

We recognize that there can be valid differences of opinion as to what is and what is not "in good taste"; I can only say that it has been the unanimous view of those with whom I have consulted that the cartoon in question is "in poor taste." You are apparently of a different opinion, but it is we that have the responsibility of managing a University Printing Service.

D. G. Tyndall

Is it oppression of women? She calls the shots—he jumps

There is a great deal of attention paid by The Gateway to the liberation of women.

I agree that women are an oppressed group but no one seems to realize that men are oppressed also. This is particularly noticeable in the institution of marriage and divorce for here men are oppressed by women.

• In the breakup of a home the boy's wishes need not be considered at all. In the eyes of the courts the mother has first rights to the little boy.

• If the man is so foolish as to marry he is at the mercy of his wife. He is responsible for all her bills and responsible financially for all the children she has during their marriage whether the children are his or not biologically.

• If she decides to break the marriage vows, that is her business. She has a right to male friends. Just try to prove adultery.

It is harder than you think.

• The present divorce laws are made for the women. What court is going to have much sympathy for a man who is pleading physical or mental cruelty? Poor helpless wife. Groan.

• From the breakup of the home the wife has complete rights to the children unless she can be proven to be a totally unfit mother. Despite the fact that the husband may incidentally love his children, the visitation privilege to his children lies totally at the mercy of his wife. The husband's place is to beg for the privilege of seeing his own children and his place is to support the children despite the fact that he may not be able to see them.

So as it can be seen the married man faces oppression from his wife. She calls the shots and he jumps or else.
Geraldine Sicard
arts 3

An explanation of why people censor things away

By Winston Gereluk

Co-ordinator Grant's censorship of that cartoon in last Friday's paper was not in itself an event worthy of comment. It is valuable, however, in that it gives us an excuse to examine something which has too long remained uncriticized; the basis for the practice of censorship.

It seems that before any censorship takes place at all the would-be censor has to accept (albeit unwittingly) a formula or proposition which runs more or less as follows:

If I (we, the government, the polity, the print shop foreman, etc.) find an item (book, movie cartoon, TV show, etc.) objectionable (obscene, weird, filthy, pornographic, etc.),

THEN it follows that this item is objectionable

AND FURTHER that it should be banned (cut, censored, omitted, not printed, etc.).

The difficulties in making the above assumptions seem obvious, but that hasn't stopped very many from proceeding to censor anyway. And still the question—How does one transform his personal value structure into a rule for society?—when no two people can be found who fully agree in their value definitions?

The answer is supplied every time somebody censors something anyway. Censorship is not dependant on agreement, only on power; the question is not "what is right?" but "who is right?"

Everyone of us is quite sure about what we like and don't like. So, when a person finds himself in a position of power it doesn't take long for him to decide that what he likes is in fact

likeable and what he finds objectionable is indeed objectionable. All that is needed, then, is to make others see the light (or at least to protect them from darkness).

It's from his position of unquestioned power, that the wise father shields his son's eyes from scenes of violence, the knowledgeable president his subjects from subversive rumors, the infallible Vicar his faithful from heretical literature, the Social Credit government its population from Tom Jones, and the print shop director the students from pictures of sexual intercourse.

But one can't argue with what power does; one can only be troubled. And what troubles me is: What happens to the censor who reads, views, listens, and thinks those things which the rest of the populace must be kept from reading, viewing, listening to, and thinking for its own good?

That censor must either be someone whose soul is already condemned to eternal damnation—or else it must be a noble martyr who is willing to subject himself to corruption so that we may all be saved.

Only, whoever is trying his best hasn't succeeded. Just the other day, I heard a politician speak over the radio about participatory democracy, and that's disgusting. And, for the last two days, I've watched TV newscasters raving about a moon shot, and in the face of the poverty and starvation in this world, that's obscene. And right now, there are people who have just finished reading this column. God help them. Amen.