

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Winner N. A. M. MacKenzie trophy for excellence in features 1965-66. Winner Montreal Star trophy for excellence in news photography 1965-66. Second in Bracken trophy competition for editorial writing 1965-66 and third in Southam trophy competition for general excellence 1965-66.

Editor-in-Chief - - - - Don Sellar

Managing Editor Bill Miller
News Editor Al Bromling
Asst. News Editor, Helene Chomiak
Sports Editor Bryan Campbell
Associate Editor Doug Walker
Page Five Linda Strand
Fine Arts Editor John Thompson
Photo Editor Neil Driscoll

EDITORIAL: CUP Dateline Editor: Ginger Bradley. Desk: Jim Rennie. Cartoonists: Dale Drever, Peter Bassek. Production Manager: Joe Will. Office Manager: Peter Enns. Editorial Board: Don Sellar, Doug Walker, Bruce Ferrier, Bill Miller, Linda Strand. Editorial Assistant: Carole Kaye. Librarian: Lois Berry.

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Workers for Monday's paper are listed here. Of course, they include John Westmore, Bev Bayer, Lawrie Hignell, Sheila Ballard, Lorraine Allison, Marion Conybeare, Gloria Skuba, Ralph Melnychuk, Lorraine Minich, Richard Vivone, Ekkehard Kottke, Bill Beard, Marilyn Fix, Peter Montgomery, The White Tornado, Marilyn Sellar, and yours truly, Harvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published daily this week by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline (including short items): for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday: advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday: for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday: advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager: Alex Hardy. Office phone—433-1155. Circulation—8,300. Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton.

PAGE TWO

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1966

mr. pearson's panacea

The new Canadian parliamentary session opens today in Ottawa, amid rumors of an imaginative program of federal aid to universities. Political pundits are already filling the country's daily newspapers with material proclaiming the eventual arrival of "free college education" in Canada. It is significant, however, to note that these writers have failed to define the term "free" education and have therefore contributed to and mirrored a great public ignorance on the subject.

For example, the Canadian Union of Students has come out in favor of "universal accessibility to post-secondary education" with a secondary target involving the removal of all tuition fees at Canadian universities. This stand has been interpreted generally as one advocating "free education," when it does no such thing. Free education, say CUS officials, is a goal which involves the provision of books, transportation to and from university, room-and-board charges and living expenses in addition to free tuition.

Not even Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition could provide students with such massive aid. But what will the Pearson government be willing to do for students?

One writer, Peter C. Newman, sees the government's legislative thrust in education as "an imaginative program of federal aid to universities," which "may be the final major social initiative of a government which has already given Canadians a universal pension plan and a labor code, has launched the Canada assistance plan and a

war on poverty, and has pledged itself to a national system of medicare."

Basically, the new government education program is believed to consist of massive amounts of money channeled into bursaries (on the basis of need) and scholarships (on the basis of merit); increased per capita grants to Canadian universities and colleges from federal coffers and allocation of large additional sums for federally-sponsored research at universities. Such a program is not only a good one to talk about on the hustings—it is the kind of program which is neither controversial nor difficult to push through an ornery Commons.

Most of the government's program, which certainly does not show any sign of bringing free education closer to reality, has apparently come out of recommendations made last October by the Bladen Commission on financing higher education in Canada, a report sponsored by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. The report predicts that the current university enrolment of 178,200 will increase to 461,000 in the next ten years, and that in the same period government aid to higher education would have to jump from \$355 million to \$1,704 million.

The Liberal Party, like all the other political parties in Canada, has been spurred into action by alarming figures which plainly show why the clearly provincial field of education is one which requires federal intervention and assistance.

University students across Canada will be waiting eagerly today for the announcement of Mr. Pearson's panacea for higher education. Today's Speech from the Throne is a document which could herald a new and enlightened approach to education in this country.

ontario report analysis

television lectures modify learning process

by cliff will
reprinted from the mcmaster silhouette

Critics of the boob-tube beware—TV lectures are here to stay.

This prediction is made in a 28-page report prepared for the heads of Ontario's provincially-assisted universities and colleges, and published in December. The reason? Television lectures offer advantages to the direct system both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The quantitative advantages are obvious, says the report. More students can be taught by fewer instructors. The use of video-tape greatly increases the scope of the TV classroom. Television offers a number of qualitative advantages, especially in the fields of science and medicine. Such delicate observations as the staining of a slide, certain dental techniques or the scanning of detailed graphs can be made easily visible to a large studio audience.

By 1970 there will be a shortage of qualified professors in Canadian universities, says the report. About 8,300 full-time staff will be needed in all Ontario universities in 1970-71. From the present level of 3,700, the provincially-assisted Ontario universities will need between 600 and 900 additional staff members each year. But only 190

Ph.D.s were granted in Ontario in 1963-64.

The purpose of television will then be to "make optimum use of the talents of every staff member who will be available." Television will also solve some of the problems of increased enrolment, by enabling the professor to give his lecture once and reach the whole class, leaving more time to conduct seminars, meet students individually and pursue his own research and supervision.

Television, says the report, seems to be a practical way to have the very best lecturers made available to all. It also supplies a helpful method to achieve uniformity of instruction, especially in introductory courses. The use of videotape gives the additional advantage of being able to repeat lectures. The report predicts the establishment of tape libraries, where students may have explanations and portions of lectures repeated.

The principle of qualitative improvement, the report states, "is generally accepted by the academic community, though its application to a widening spectrum of subjects is moving through a cycle of initial resistance, experimentation and evaluation."

"The most serious doubts are based on the fear that television may debase the whole process of higher education." The fear is that the "professional virtues of sincere and humble scholar-



what's in mike's bag for university students?

the label of hate

by bryan campbell

People are fighting, demonstrating, escalating and dying in Vietnam.

Not a very world-shaking statement at first glance—but there's more to it than a first glance. People are the last thing anyone mentions when they talk of Vietnam. They talk of V.C., Communists, aggressors, Capitalists, Imperialists—the list is endless. Anything for a label, you can't hate without a label.

According to the State Department "White Paper" of February 17, 1965, Ho Chi Minh is the leader of the "Communist regime in Hanoi" and is behind the "infiltrators from North Viet Nam who make up the vast majority of the so-called hard-core Viet Cong, as well as accompanying terrorists, and espionage and propaganda agents."

The other side is no better. A recent issue of World Student News calls the Viet-

nam affair a "War of Atrocity" and lists the evils of the "American aggressors". World Student News selects quotes to stir hate. The magazine quotes one report to the International Control Commission as follows:

"It (the report) specified among its complaints 'decapitations, eviscerations and public displays of murdered women and children . . . 650,000 people have been maimed by firearms and torture,'"

The "Imperialists" are behind it, according to the World Student News.

If you count carefully you will find 12 labels for hate inside the quotation marks.

A label is a peculiar thing. Once you have labelled it you don't have to think of it in human terms. You are killing the label and that's easy. It's not easy to kill the man next door because you know him as a person. A North Vietnamese is just a Communist.

And to the North Vietnamese the American soldier is just an Imperialist aggressor and easy to kill.

But it doesn't stop there. Ho Chi Minh and Lyndon Johnson are labels for hate. If you take a stand on one side of the issue one of these two ceases to be a person. For the Americans, Ho Chi Minh is the epitome of the Communist tyrant. He is not unlike Stalin or Castro or Hitler—even though Hitler wasn't a Communist—to the American mind, Ho Chi Minh is horrible. There is nothing good about Ho Chi Minh.

Once he is labelled, Ho is automatically opposed to every value in the Western way of life.

Lyndon Johnson undergoes the same transformation in the minds of the other side. He stands for oppression, hate, slaughter and murder. He carries the bomb, the gas, the phosphorous explosives in his quick-draw holster.

Remove the labels and look at Vietnam in human terms—the picture changes surprisingly.

In the light of day both these men have a lot in common. I think they are both working for the same end—a fruitful solution. Ho Chi Minh is an old man. He has been in politics since the late 1920s and he has been fighting for the Vietnamese almost continuously. Ho Chi Minh has seen the Japanese, the French and the Americans. Lyndon Johnson has a record stretching back into the New Deal days of President Roosevelt.

Both are good men without the labels. I hope good men don't use labels too.