



editorial

Don't blame Council, blame yourselves for power short

Listen, are there any philosophers out there on campus? Any Machiavellian-types skulking our hallowed halls? Or those who believe in pure forms of power and Mosca's adage "there will always be rulers ... and those who will be ruled"?

If there are we can picture them gathering together over furtive cups of ouzo (maybe Baby Duck) and talking politics in surreptitious tones these days, what with nominations for Students' Union Executive positions due by 5 PM Tuesday and elections a mere two weeks away ... But for the other nineteen thousand nine hundred and some odd students around here, the practical aspect of wasting \$34 per year on a students' political organization merely prompts idle laughter over a foamy head in RATT.

We suppose the argument runs that you have to pay for the bowling and the pool anyway, the beer's not really much cheaper, the cafeteria food is horrible anyway, and once you take away the circuses (we mean socials, of course) there's not a helluva lot left.

A large portion of the SU's time and effort has been directed at services ... sometimes with mixed results and efficiencies, (generally, inefficiencies due to the administrative aspects of a bureaucratic organization).

But although services must certainly be provided for the students, one should remember that the idea of a students' union was based on the notion of providing a unified voice and power base for a group of largely-powerless students at university, i.e. the undergrads.

Great ideal, huh? How is it then, that we've never lived up to it? Haven't we paid our five members of the Students' Council (the Executive) each year to represent our interests? And haven't we elected 20 individuals to the Students' Council to speak up for us and make our concerns known? Then if we've never lived up to our political ideals, it must be the fault of either the Executive and/or the Council, right? Maybe not.

Maybe it's just that most people have forgotten the thought of individual responsibility. Why put in time or energy to student politics after you've already contributed your \$34? You've sacrificed the equivalent of 6-8 hours wages ... to contribute more would be to add insult to injury. So let the President do his job ... and the Executive ... Council; Executive representation will win us freedom from our academic concerns, after all. Won't it?

What most undergrads don't know is that in the myriad system of academic political power, a large amount of policy is formed at the faculty or even departmental level. The major advisory body to the Board of Governors is General Faculties Council. Feeding into GFC are deans' councils, faculty committees, curriculum committees, etcetera. Despite the fact that SU councils in the 60s fought hard to obtain large student representation on just such committees, it is now difficult and sometimes impossible to persuade, push, or cajole undergrads into sitting on such groups.

Even on GFC, where there are whopping 35 undergrad representatives out of 127 members (and that amounts to a bit of power), it is difficult to obtain representatives from the undergrad body ... and this, one of the most prestigious policy-making bodies on campus! Where is the individual's concern or effort? Let's all leave it up to reps we didn't vote for, right?

So for all you folks out there who sit on your fat asses and bitch about (1) the lousy life on campus, (2) the lousy curriculums you're forced to study, and (3) the inability of Students' Council to deal with these problems ... stuff it. It doesn't get better by talking about it ... and it doesn't get better if you don't elect the representatives you want and at the same time take a little greater interest in political affairs.

Last year over fifteen thousand undergrads couldn't even take the time to mark an X on a ballot in order to elect student reps whom they believed capable of voicing their concerns. If you don't take the trouble this year (small though it is), please don't give us a pain in the ass by complaining that you're getting a raw deal, if it's too rough on you, flush it.

The Gateway Staff



letters

TOEFL too much

The University of Alberta has silently imposed an additional entrance requirement to certain groups of Canadian citizens so that most of the applicants from ethnic groups can easily be impeded for admissions (landed immigrants and foreign students are also included).

Applicants including French Canadians, Eskimos, Indians, and Canadians of other ethnic groups who have taken part of the elementary and secondary education in their native language are required to present a score of 600 in the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language). There is no exception even if an applicant has demonstrated his/her ability to master English in fulfilling the University of Alberta entrance requirement by fully matriculating from an English speaking Alberta high school.

The only way the University of Alberta can mandate this policy is to discriminate applicants based on place of origin (if not race). Whether the University of Alberta is successful in evading the law has yet to be decided by the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

Your further investigation in this matter with the University of Alberta officials, Students' Union, and other ethnic groups on campus will be appreciated. More educated citizens are required for the growth of this nation. No citizens should be denied the right of education by unfair policy.

Name withheld by request

Dear Name:

At your request I did some investigating, and have found your main complaints a bit unfounded.

Professor Hough, Administrative Officer of Student Counselling (which administers

the exam) says Canadian citizens are no longer required to take the TOEFL exam. Regarding complaints that only the top ten per cent pass the test, Hough says the requirements used to be lower, and students allowed in under the lower restrictions were dropping out because they couldn't master the language, either written or spoken.

By the same token, though, I'd still like to see, how the average U of A student would fare on an English proficiency exam. The results, if the exam could be administered fairly, would probably be both interesting and enlightening.

Ed.

Relatively comparatively boring

By way of reply to the arts column review of Walterdale Players' *Relatively Speaking* from *Gateway*, January 22. I would like to say that the critic must be thrilled by the suspense of Nancy Drew mysteries if this situation comedy excited him. The plot of *Relatively Speaking* is as a soap opera; I had it easily deciphered by the end of the first half-hour. The same "comic" situation is repeated, worked over, digested, and regurgitated until supreme boredom reigns for the remaining hour of the play until the surprise ending, and barely that, relieves one of the social obligation to see the play through. As for this play being an "absolute smash", I would like to revise that cliché to read an "absolutely smashing bore".

M. Burcher

Zionism "paranoic"

Mr. Aranov speaks of the misuse of the term "anti-semitism", and presents cogent and valid arguments for changing that term to one which will imply only "anti-Jewish". There are weaknesses even with this term, though, particularly in its meaning. Who is "anti-Jewish"? How does one become such a

creature? Zionism would say that all non-Jews whose cultures have had large-scale historical dealings with Jews are in the mass "anti-semitic"; that men in groups (as opposed to the individual some of whose best friends are Jews) will tend, for whatever reason, to be anti-semitic, and that the sole way for Jews to avoid this is through the creation of a Jewish state. Zionism creates all the prejudice toward other nations that other forms of blind nationalism do, with a little touch of paranoia to flavor the mixture.

We next come to Mr. Aranov's statements upon the history of Arab terrorism toward Jews. The Grand Mufti, as black as any villain of our century, is cast entirely as an anti-semitic. This ignores the fact that the Mufti's gunmen killed more Arabs than Jews through the course of his career, even though he served with the S.S. The Mufti was an equal opportunity terrorist, who didn't care about race, creed or religion. If the Arab terrorists of today are in fact descended from any group of that period, it is the Irgun, one of the most prominent Israeli terrorist groups. Like these terrorists, they believed that the best way to create a state of their liking was through the murder of innocent women and children; and like the PLO, they have achieved respectability in their own country. One of their big boys, Mr. Begim, is now the head of the largest opposition party in the Israeli Knesset.

Due to lack of space, it is impossible to really deal with Mr. Aranov's other points. Yet if Israel is a land of milk and honey for Arab and Jew alike, why then does the Arab population want out? And despite the fact that God spoke to the primitive Jews and inspired them to massacre and drive the Canaanites from Canaan, can we really believe that God spoke to Golda Meir and David Ben-Gurion and told them the same? Is Moshe Dayan on the same terms with Jehovah as Joshua? If Mr. Aranov believes that to be true, then I am left to wonder who'll get to play the Assyrians and come down like the wolf on the fold.

John Ferris