

U of A seeking academic isolation

The Editor;

I don't mind people who don't think; in fact some of my best acquaintances are non-thinkers and I've played pool, had coffee, and even just talked with a lot of them in my three disillusioning but most edifying years of university. However, this latest triumph of apathy has, I must admit, made me rather bitter. Although I believe I understand why CUS was turned down, I honestly cannot understand why the inmates of this asylum were so willing to allow themselves to be manipulated in such a ruthless and cynical manner.

The debates on CUS were interesting and informative, and the consensus (really) was that the pro-CUS representatives were better informed, more rational, and consequentially more persuasive than their opponents.

But what the hell, the meagre audiences in attendance included very few of those 5,000-odd people who voted to stay out of the organization. They already knew how they were going to vote; Miss Pilkington had told them.

A xenophobic, anti-intellectual university may seem like a rather unlikely anomaly, but my god, that's what we've got here. Mere physical isolation from the rest of Canada wasn't enough for us, so we opted for academic isolation also. But maybe it's for the best, CUS I wouldn't want to feel responsible for contaminating any other university with whatever the mental illness prevalent here is; its hard enough getting to sleep anyway.

D. W. Campbell

Good! — We do question things

The Editor;

In recent months the student body of The University of Alberta has been stirred to action—an unbelievable event. It took a small group of radical students, spurred on by certain faculty members, like Ahmad, Frucht, and Mills. The emotional verbiage and the character debasing speeches of these individuals has had a healthy effect on the typical apathetic student.

At last we are questioning our university structure and the educational system. This is good!

The structure needs some change, and the students should have a meaningful voice in the university.

Now that we are stirred to action, and more aware of the problems and issues surrounding a new university, let us *not* be duped by a fascist minority who would lead us blindly to destroy the present system only to place themselves in the power position. Let us not be used!

We must work towards formulating meaningful and constructive alternatives which eloquent words and emotional outbursts will never give us.

Peter DeVros
Grad Studies

No ads, please

During a recent visit to The University of Alberta, I was disgusted. Advertising ought not to be allowed in lecture rooms.

Airlines, dances, and magazines all are pushed in a single classroom.

Al Hetherington
London, Ontario

Feiffer

IN THE PAST I FAVORED DIALOGUE WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT, BELIEVING THAT IN TIME IT WOULD LEAD, THROUGH A PROCESS OF CONCESSIONS, TO A GRADUAL ACCEPTANCE OF RADICAL CHANGE. THESE VIEWS, NOTWITHSTANDING MY EARLY DIALOGUES WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT PROVED WHOLLY DISAPPOINTING, THE OTHER SIDE ARGUING THAT THE BRINGING OF DIFFERENCES WAS PROGRESS ENOUGH, MY SIDE HOLDING OUT FOR MEANINGFUL CHANGE. FURTHER DIALOGUES LED ONLY TO FURTHER MIS-UNDERSTANDINGS WHICH BECAME THE



SUBJECT FOR NEW DIALOGUES DURING WHICH PREVIOUS POSITIONS WERE RESTATED AND PREVIOUS CONCESSIONS REAFFIRMED, AND ONCE MORE NOT CARRIED OUT SINCE DIALOGUES ARE MEANT TO SERVE AS A SAFETY VALVE AGAINST VIOLENCE I WONDERED WHY THE MORE WE TALKED THE MORE I FELT BRUTALIZED EVENTUALLY HAVING NO CHOICE BUT TO TURN INARTICULATE BECAUSE I WAS UNWILLING TO ADMIT THAT THE ONLY WORD I COULD THINK OF SAYING WAS: "KILL."



FINALLY I WAS FORCED TO STOP TALKING IN ORDER NOT TO START KILLING. THE ESTABLISHMENT BLAMES THE COLLAPSE OF OUR DIALOGUES ON A BREAKDOWN IN COMMUNICATION.



FOR THEIR SAKE I HOPE THEY DO NOT SUCCEED IN REESTABLISHING CONTACT.



LIKE MAN Y'KNOW.



We lost — but it isn't the end

By Peter Boothroyd

Well, fellow losers, it was to be expected wasn't it. I mean, given the political history of this student body, it's not surprising we got beat three to one on the CUS issue. If anything, we should be surprised that there were 1,754 of us who saw through the deluge of carefully chosen words, questionable figures, irrelevant anecd-

otes and content-free speeches offered by the leading anti-CUSers.

Let's face it, more people find it easier to be shocked by Ho Chi Minh's picture being used to cover that of the Queen's than to be challenged by the idea of a socially responsible national students' union. More people would rather accept billboard figures about decreasing membership in CUS than take the time to understand the history of the organization who wants to bother learning that the Quebec students pulled out of CUS because of nationalist sentiments and because when they were in, it had been the kind of wishy-washy organization advocated by Marilyn Pilkington and other anti-CUSers.

But of course, the most difficult to overcome of all the obstacles to thought is the continuous, and superficially impressive line, about the necessity of student unions being apolitical.

The line is impressive because we've been taught all through school that politics start and end with friendly competition among political parties.

Special interest groups such as student unions should only get involved in politics on matters of direct interest to them. Since the leading anti-CUSers believe in—or say they believe in—this delimitation of politics, they brand CUS a "left-wing political party"

because it is concerned with the larger social issues. Conversely, because our own students' council stays away from larger issues—or thinks it does—it is regarded as the paragon of responsible student government.

Further, this line is palatable because it relieves students of the burden of having to think about just what their personal political politics, it is opposed only with position is. The student is given the secure feeling that if he just votes to stay out of CUS, and trusts a students' council which promises to avoid making political decisions, then he can relax in the knowledge that nobody is going to express political views which he *might* not like.

Because this apology for the apolitical is so easy to understand, and so welcome in its assurances that students need not think about difficulty. The pro-CUSer is forced to show that students' council is no less political than CUS—it is just more willing to support the status quo, and in general more politically confused.

In order to substantiate his point, the pro-CUS speaker must talk about the nature of politics and the students' role in society. For too many students, such abstractions are boring. They are unwilling to employ the mental energy required to think critically in directions not determined by their high school social studies

teachers.

By the same token, it was a ridiculously simple task for the anti-CUSers to link CUS with communism through innuendo, snidery, and sometimes just plain deceit.

Anyway we lost. This has disheartened a lot of people for unfortunately, this is a society interested only in winners. Our history textbooks underplay or ignore movements which have lost the struggles for power. Medieval heresies, 19th century anarchists and 20th century socialists in Western countries are sometimes mentioned in terms of dramatic incidents, but rarely are they analyzed as a phenomenon. Ten years from now when Richard Nixon is still a household name, the name Eugene McCarthy will be largely forgotten. With such a historical orientation we tend to concentrate on the big battles—the so-called "decisive events"—and disregard the nature of long-term developments. The growth of student political awareness is one such long-term development. It was inordinately optimistic to think that U of A would have joined CUS this year. But similarly, it is pessimistically unrealistic to think that the present state of consciousness will always exist. The times they are a changin' . . . and the CUS referendum notwithstanding U of A students are part of that change.

Despite accusations of selfishness . . .

The Editor,

In accordance with the student's council request that students remain mindless as long as possible, and also in accordance with Ian Smith's request that blacks remain animals as long as possible, I declare, seeing the situation as somewhat of an emergency, that I shall have no part or whole organ of any existing professor or student councillor's body, mind or soul transplanted into my dead, half-dead or otherwise living body, mind or sole even if the intention be to better the constitution of either participant.

Also I declare, despite any accusations of selfishness, that I shall not have any part of my body etc., transplanted into the body of any professor, administrator or councillor regardless of his or her race, colour, creed, or sex, not even if he's a wasp.

Peter Roberts,
BA 3

Throw up somewhere else!

The Editor,

I resent having something like Brian Campbell's "I Want to Throw Up" inflicted on me.

If he was trying to communicate some message, I have no idea what it was. Neither does anyone else I've heard comment on it. It seems rather to be the personal ravings of a sick mind.

The next time Mr. Campbell wants to throw up, let him do it in private!

Audrey Holrod
(grad studies)

SOLILOQUY

WE WANT ACADEMIC CHANGES AND WE WANT THEM NOW...



...IF THESE DEMANDS AREN'T SATISFIED IMMEDIATELY...



...WE MAY FORGET WHAT THEY ARE!

