

mr. vivone explains his position. mr. rosen defends treasure van. mr. o'malley and mr. krempton discuss protests and morality. mr. saidman tells all about radio. bye-bye for now.

letters

rich rebuts

There are some things that should be cleared up about marching band and my attitudes toward same. The letter thought, written and submitted by myself on Nov. 10 was a direct reply to Steve Rybak's column of Nov. 10.

In that article, Mr. Rybak wrote, "the Golden Bear Marching Band needs \$8,000 to get to Toronto".

Mr. Rybak contends this money should come out of the University Athletic Board fund which (Mr. Rybak says) should be increased by another \$4 per student. I said 'no' then and I say 'no' now. 'No' to the increase and 'no' to the money for the marching band.

That is exactly what the letter said.

Also, the article said the UAB could sponsor students' trips out of town. I say no. I go on some when I have the time and I get loaded if I feel like it because it is my own money. I do not expect the UAB to pay any portion of my vacation. Others should not either.

My largest bitch is that I saw the Marching Band put on an excellent show in Vancouver last year but have yet to see them put on such performances for the people right here at home. Yes, I know the Toronto performance was great too. But, did they do it here this year? No answer required. Impressions are more important at home. It seems the band saves the best for the road.

Rich Vivone
sci 3

treasure van

Comment on the editorial "who needs a balalaika", Nov. 28.

As Chairman of Treasure Van 1967/68, I was most disappointed in the editorial produced by the Editorial Staff of The Gateway in the above article "Yet, when the goods for the sale arrive, many students find most of the items quite useless. Those goods which are worth buying are also sold in many import shops downtown—often of slightly higher quality."

When I confronted the Gateway Editor, (whose office is about a minute walk from my own) about how she had come about making these most unconvincing statements, she said she had based her decisions on previous Treasure Vans. I then questioned her on her knowledge of merchandising, and what experience she personally had in that area or what professional advice she had received. Her statement was that she had no experience in the merchandising area and had not attempted to gain any advice from somebody qualified in that field. This was also her statement in reference to prices of Treasure Van goods compared to those in shops downtown.

The editor nor any of her staff at any time asked myself or my committee for permission to see our list of goods for Treasure Van 1967/68, or to go over the quality of these goods or their prices. Had

they asked it would have been our pleasure to have shown the goods to them.

The point is this, the Editorial will not greatly financially affect Treasure Van, for in our first day of sales, December 4, we set a new Canadian record for sales in one day. But it is the affront to the some 1,400 students who in some way or another had given their time willingly and freely to work on the project.

Thus my objective in this letter, to thank those of you who have worked to make this the finest Treasure Van in Canadian History and to point out the irresponsibility of the Gateway Editorial Staff in attempting to find out the true facts before making sweeping opinions.

Student Council at their December 4 meeting fully endorsed Treasure Van and its programmings. One councillor rather unhappily pointed out "this is not the first and very probably not the last time this type of carelessness would take place in a Gateway Editorial."

Bob Rosen
Chairman
Treasure Van 1967/68

on martyrs

I should like to reply to Keith Locke's letter published in The Gateway on Nov. 28 in which Keith supports the martyrdom of Che.

Is a man a martyr if he dies in violent protest against what he believes is wrong? I believe not.

The martyrs we acclaim, such as the German people of Jewish faith who died at the hands of the Nazis, gave their lives peacefully while silently and peacefully protesting a regime they could not correct. The Christian martyrs of the Roman Empire died like lambs, not like terrorists.

Although we can admire the aspiration towards change in the Bolivian regime (which I am prepared to accept as bad, without knowing fully the situation there), it is not possible to accept violent overthrow without accepting a doctrine whereby the end justifies the means.

If our objection to the Bolivian regime is that it denies basic human rights to the Bolivian people, how can we consistently favor a method of overthrow which would deny those same basic human rights to the members of the present ruling class?

In order to be consistent in a quest for human rights (and this constitutes the greatest practical downfall of all pacifist reform movements) it is necessary to grant those rights to all, both during and after the change.

My objection to the glorification of Che Guevara is then that Che would deny the privileges he fought for to those against which he fought. Had he been prepared to die without taking the lives of his opposition, had he been prepared to give his life rather than take the life of any Bolivian, had he been a martyr, then I should also join in his acclaim.

Unfortunately, he was not a martyr. He was committed to action which he knew would not be acceptable under any circumstances in the regime he would impose; he wanted to establish human dignity by denying it. How can we then acclaim him?

The problem, as Keith Locke rightly points out, does not stop here. It is a problem of universal concern, which is the result of the double standard under which man justifies the acts of war so atrocious to us all in peace time.

A moral system, generally accepted if not generally practised in peace time, which has taken mankind several thousands of years to develop and refine in even its broadest practical implications, is entirely neglected and indeed repudiated by men when a situation of war arises.

This letter would be incomplete and as vacuous as most protests must be, without some attempt at constructive criticism. Let me then go from controversial criticism to controversial prescription.

It appears that man's commitment to amoral and indeed immoral methods to obtain moral objectives is the problem.

We go to war, I hope, to defend essentially moral principles. And yet even in the pragmatic sense, our objectives do not seem to be met. A current threat is put down perhaps, but our own moral principles are prostituted with lasting effect in the process. Is not the martyrdom of Che an outstanding example of this?

How can the defence of moral principles be carried out without resorting to immoral methods?

Since I am committed to idealism, let me propose the ideal alternative. A method which, to my understanding, is currently in congruence with all moral systems, the method of charity. Yes, I am saying turn the other cheek; yes, I am saying be meek and humble under the aggressiveness of your adversary, because if you believe in your moral system enough, this is the stuff martyrs are made of. This is how social change can be brought about by moral methods.

How powerful a method can this be? We have seen it used successfully in the first stage of the civil rights movement in the United States; we have seen it succeed under Ghandi in India.

However, we have not, to my knowledge, seen it succeed against completely amoral adversaries. But, perhaps we have.

Admittedly, the Bolshevik revolution did not retain power in Russia, but how many of the Bolshevik objectives (both moral and physical) have been achieved by submission to a rule which was at least in the past completely immoral? But, the analogy breaks down of course because immoral methods were used (no matter by whom). Perhaps, the only success has been Japan, where, since World War II at least, the use of peaceful methods of change has produced the desired moral and physical outcome.

It can be concluded then that

other methods do exist, have been used, and have achieved some measure of success without the use of amoral methods. The practical answer I propose, to those who claim that no protestors ever have concrete suggestions, is a direct application of our moral principles to every relationship we have with our neighbors.

Now let me hear the howls of derision.

Tony O'Malley
grad studies

protests are good

I am sick of seeing treatments of the Dow Chemical protest at the University of Toronto in the press (especially the student press) which miss the point of and downgrade the significance of the activity to Canadian feeling and policy vis-a-vis the United States. Treatments like that of Rich Vivone (Gateway, December 1), flippant and illconsidered nonsense that they are, only cloud perspective. I would like to focus attention on what I think are some of the real concerns.

None but the most naive protestor would conceive of his actions as nothing more than an attempt to stop Dow from producing napalm. In the larger sense, and crucial to the point of protesting publicly, the whole thing was to point out that a large manufacturer is making a substantial profit by selling weapons to a nation engaged in a war against a small country over contrived issues. These issues being couched in the loftiest of ideological terminology, when in reality, the stakes are international prestige and power to be gained at the expense of the suffering of the people of Vietnam.

The protest against Dow's recruiting was an attempt to forcefully point out to a rather complacent and seemingly unconcerned Canada that by allowing Dow to recruit men and material in Canada, it is lending a hand to the immoral and illegal destruction of Vietnam at the hands of the Americans, while allowing Dow a handsome profit for its troubles. Further, the protest, like other public displays of indig-

nation over this war, was designed to arouse the democratic process from its inaction in an attempt to bring pressure on the United States to stop its war against Vietnam. In this regard, the protest was not unlike any other political activity designed to sway public opinion.

It certainly seems to the credit of the protestors that they were willing to face the almost sure misinterpretation and misrepresentation of their endeavor by acting in a manner consistent with their beliefs. The objection will be raised that their action was beyond the bounds of reasonable dissent. The inaction they were seeking to dispel is beyond reasonable responsibility in a democracy. Must one conclude from such inaction, coupled with the determination of many to miss the point of active dissent, that Canadians approve and applaud the American war in Vietnam and wish to see it continue and grow?

Murray Krempton
arts 3

knock the rock

I would like to reply to the recent letter of Ian Coull regarding his criticism of the music policy at U of A student radio. It is obvious that Mr. Coull is a frosh or he would not even hint that student radio regress to the state that his simple CHED type mind can understand. The rock music of today combines overstated semi-philosophical theories of today with a rhythm that appeals purely to the animal drives—and then pretends to call itself intellectual music. However, radio has a responsibility to the university, and no true institute for higher learning and progressive art should stoop so low as to promote this savagery that is passed off as music.

To please the first year students, however, as well as the general teeny-bopper population, student radio does have a "rock" show during the noonhour and during most of Friday afternoons. Otherwise the policy is one of moderation and good taste.

Larry Saidman
arts 2



—reprinted from dalhousie gazette
the student housing problem still exists