

"Dismal, sarcastic reporting"

## Reader objects to a review

The Editor,

University life was given a lift three weeks ago with the two concerts presented by the New Folk. They were fantastic—I mean really great! Not unexpected, the Gateway came up with its usual dismal, sarcastic reporting of yet another highlight of this year.

The New Folk are professional. Their music is of high quality, their choreography was superbly synchronized, their lighting and stage props were effective, and their message was certainly worth listening to with an open mind. I strong object to Bill Psnak's write-up of Jan. 16, for it displays a narrow, closed mind of an individual who didn't even have enough . . . to remain

for the second half of the concert.

Many of us believe that Christianity can be made relevant, alive and vibrant in the lives and personalities of varsity students. The New Folk not only believe that, but are out to prove it. If Bob Dylan, Janis Ian, Jimi Hendrix etc. . . . can sing a philosophy of frustration, loneliness, despair, seeming unrest and social concern, who's to condemn the New Folk for displaying an optimistic sound. A sound which talks about, "a changed life", peace, freedom, satisfaction, fulfillment, meaning and a genuine purpose for living. To suggest that this is propaganda in a sloppy form is ludicrous and immature. The New Folk didn't ram the "bible" down our throats, nor did they "clobber us with the

cross". What they *did* do was to honestly share with their audience, their own personal faith in God. Faith is not a crutch for the weak-minded, nor is it intellectual suicide. Faith is believing in God in the presence of doubt . . . while you're working through doubt. Faith is *not* the absence of doubt. The absence of doubt is the absence of thinking.

Many of us are grateful and appreciative of the honest approach taken by the New Folk. Marshall McLuhan says, "the medium is the message." The New Folks' medium is through contemporary pop and folk rock, and their message is equally as pertinent and contemporary.

Keith Anderson  
arts 1

## Is this a sarcastic letter?

The Editor,

The letter written by A. Lund, ed. 1, concerning student radicals and the organization of a massive non-radical student gathering certainly merits attention. Mr. Lund deserves praise for his brilliant, in-depth analysis of the student-power "bullshit".

Mr. Lund, unfortunately, has failed to realize the full potential that his suggested gathering of non-radical students could have. Once gathered, the righteous non-radicals could then proceed to occupy the Arts and Tory Build-

ings where, to my knowledge, most of the radical elements on this campus congregate. Once the occupations are completed, the non-radicals could, by the use of a few brutal beatings and forced haircuts, straighten some of "those bastards" out. The non-radicals should also take control of The Gateway just in case there are any radicals, communists, or other such scum on the editorial staff.

After the campus purification has been completed the non-radicals must be vigilant. Control of the various buildings must not re-

vert to the Administration; it has proven its communist sympathies by allowing the presence of the radical "bastards" which we now have to contend with. To insure future purity, The Gateway should also remain under the direction of non-radical students. Perhaps The Gateway's name could be changed to something more inspiring, such as "The Middle Ground".

How wonderful life would be if our campus could be rid of the radicals and their seditious "bullshit".

Ron Anderson  
ed 3

## MARIJUANA — case was callous

*A professor analyzes the AMA article*

The Editor,

I would like to comment on the statement on marijuana made in The Gateway of Friday, Jan. 10 which was taken from a statement by the Committee on Problems of Drug Dependence, a committee of the American Medical Association. Aside from the conclusion that the legal penalties for the use of marijuana are excessive, this statement seems to be an astonishing mixture of hypocrisy and callousness.

The hypocrisy of this statement lies in the assertion that there has not been enough research on the effects of marijuana, particularly after long-term use or at high dosage levels, to permit it to be available legally. I do find some merit in this argument but it is hypocritical since the medical profession did freely prescribe tranquilizers and the "pill" without much knowledge of such effects and for a considerable length of time has been using electroconvulsive shock therapy on a strictly empirical basis without an understanding of the mechanisms involved and in spite of frequent symptoms of brain damage resulting from a large number of such treatments. Again, I wish to emphasize that research on the effects of marijuana is needed but it is worth noting that a large number of people have found it to be of benefit in their lives and I would suggest that their experience is no less valid than that of AMA committees.

The callousness of the statement lies in the fact that the reasons for marijuana use are not considered. In the September, 1968, issue of the *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Drs. W. M. McGlothlin and L. J. West state that "one of the most neglected questions in evaluating drug effects concerns the individual benefits which motivate the user. Drug use in many instances may well be an attempt to alleviate symptoms of psychiatric illness through self-medication. In some instances, marijuana use may postpone or prevent more serious manifestations of an illness. Especially for recreational drugs, such as alcohol and marijuana, an objective assessment of user motivation should consider: effectiveness in producing pleasure, relaxation and aesthetic appreciation, enhancement of appetite and other senses; enhancement of interpersonal rapport, warmth and emotionality, utility of variety or newness of perception and thinking; and enhancement of enjoyment of vacations, weekends or other periods devoted to recreation, rest and pleasure." I would suggest that a large part of the interest in marijuana is a result of the dullness and meaninglessness of many aspects of the "normal" middle-class life and until this is recognized and dealt with we can expect that marijuana use will continue to increase. Repression and excessive penalties do not deal with the problem and probably serve to make it more

serious since many marijuana users probably do "drop out" or become "unproductive" in some sense since they are treated so cruelly and stupidly. I do not wish to imply that legalization of marijuana is a good solution to this set of problems but I am of the opinion that this is better than what we are doing now. If the medical profession wishes to make a positive contribution to the marijuana "problem" they should try to find some way of meeting the needs of users or potential users. If the AMA is as seriously devoted to human welfare as it is to its own economic welfare, it should be capable of recognizing that the human needs for pleasure, joy and breadth of experience are legitimate and, indeed, give meaning and significance to life.

Finally, I do not wish to imply that marijuana should be used illegally since the use of even a mild psychedelic drug, such as marijuana probably is, under conditions of some anxiety is not advisable or that marijuana is free of ill-effects since any effective drug is bound to have some bad effects on some people under some conditions. I do wish to assert that we should approach the problems mentioned above with honesty, intelligence and humanity and that the AMA statement in *The Gateway* falls short of those objectives.

Kellogg V. Wilson  
Department of Psychology

By Peter Boothroyd

## Council turns them off

It has been said before that the greatest problem facing students' council is its lack of social principles upon which to base its decisions. Nowhere is this better shown than in the attitude shown toward the Indian Defence Fund.

Two weeks ago council listened to Mrs. Rose Auger, a native Company of Young Canadian worker, appeal for help to legally aid two fellow native workers recently arrested in Northern Alberta. Council granted \$100 to a defence fund established to provide legal representation for those arrested.

Some people have been astonished that council should grant so little. They will be less astonished than disgusted when they learn that at its last meeting council decided to hold off payment until the matter has been further investigated. Apparently council now sees itself as the jury of the case, and will decide in its own mind the guilt of the accused before contributing to the procurement of legal aid.

It will be understandable if the native people involved become cynical about the possibilities of co-operating with white students. One of their number came to Council, presented her case, and was given a grant. Then, the next week when nobody from the Indian group was present, and on the basis of "further information" from an unidentified source, council voted to reconsider the matter.

Students are supposed to be more idealistic than others; but on our council at least, it is still too easy to detect racism. At best, it is a matter of council members showing total disregard for the fact that people are being put in jail in our province without the benefit of legal counsel.

Granted it's Alberta, and granted most people figure an Indian deserves all the jail he gets, but one expects more from a students' council. We must admit it: U of A students are not much different from the students of Ole Miss in regard to our attitudes to non-white civil rights workers. I guess this explains why I have heard people from the North refer to natives as "niggers".

Many of these people will applaud council's decision to reconsider the grant to the Indian Defence Fund. "That'll show those niggers they can't wheedle money out of us for luxuries like legal counsel when they probably deserved to go to jail anyway." The hell of it is that it will be the same people five years from now who won't understand why Indians are no longer even trying to explain their situation to whites.

To top off the irony, the term "public relations" was mentioned later in the council meeting. Needless to say, however, the "public" to be related to is not the native peoples, nor others who do not have the money for legal aid. The so-called public is the big corporations like the Hudson's Bay Company.

There, in a nut-shell, is the whole university. First we worry about our image in the eyes of the big companies, then if we have any time left over we debate the pros and cons of providing legal aid to the poor and the discriminated.

It is timely that this should have happened this week, for in a sense, it is precisely this priority that CUS opposes. CUS also recognizes the necessity of public relations. But to CUS the public is all society—not just the rich and the powerful. And the relations to be developed are not those of the phony images PR men create, nor the obsequious thanks offered to the powerful at such annual events as the Students' Council Appreciation Banquet. The relations are to be those of fraternal involvement among people who have a common goal: the development of a truly just and democratic society.

In part, it is the idealism of students that makes many of them—but not U of A students' council—become allies of society's underdogs. In part, it is also recognition of common problems: the need for universal accessibility to higher learning and for the equalization of power in society and its institutions. CUS works to achieve these goals, and that is why, for instance, it supports the Vietnamese. Our students' council on the other hand, does not support anybody who lacks the opportunity to send his children to this university.

That perhaps explains why council has officially opposed CUS. But it also explains the votes of most people who see a world larger than council's pseudo-politics—a world in which one-fifth of Canadians are hopelessly impoverished, a world in which legal counsel is a luxury, a world in which universities train technicians for the elite and discourage student involvement with the poor. The people who do see this world are voting to join CUS.

Not because CUS is the answer. But because it is one of the means to change.