

'THE ULTIMATE ...
A DAZZLING FEAT TO SET
THE WORLD ABLAZE —"

GEORGE WALLACE'S
DOUBLE FEATURE

**1968: NAPALM ODYSSEY
and
THE WORLD WORE BLACK**


SUGGESTED FOR
JUVENILE AUDIENCES

**RIGHTS OF ADMISSION
RESERVED**

"I am in the exact middle
of my age
This is my last
ascending summer."

**RICHARD,
RICHARD.**

WHO
CARES FOR A
SHRUNKEN HEAD?



**PRAY
FOR
LYNDON'S
BABY**

Editorial

Representatives who do not represent students

According to latest reports, students at this university are now represented on such esteemed gatherings as the Board of Governors and General Faculty Council. The former, of course, is not official yet in a voting sense, but we are there.

For better than a year, we have been represented on GFC. We have three representatives—two members of the students' union and a member of the graduate students' association. Two of these 'representatives' are of the compulsory nature, i.e., president of the students' union and grad president automatically sit on these decision-making bodies. The third member is chosen by the personnel board which, of course, is a subsidiary of the students' union.

As for the Board of Governors: The story is quite similar. We have two representatives who are representative students and not representatives of the students; at least that is what the students' union president says. They are still called student consultants and await approval of the legislature before being granted full voting rights.

These are the startling facts as revealed by the students' union and they are impressive to be sure.

Except — there are people involved.

Not many students are concerned about this sort of thing. Most couldn't care less about who represents them on the upper spheres of influence. Some, however, do.

It seems to us that the students at this university should have some say in who represents them on both bodies. This business of GFC being two appointed members is bunk.

The personnel board selecting the third person is bunk also. When a students' council is elected, that is the position they are designated to fill by a student mandate. If the president decides to run for GFC also, fine—but our point is that the automatic representation on both boards is not, to borrow a reknown Alberta phrase, in the best interests of students.

Similarly with the Board of Governor's reps. As it now stands, the

president, of course, sits. The other person is selected by a special committee appointed by the students' council. Its purpose is to select one person from all those who applied. We learned that three filed applications.

But very few students know anything about the man selected. The Gateway was not informed of the meetings in which this man was questioned. We were not able to find out what he thinks, what the selection committee wanted in a board rep, or what criteria were being used in the selection.

It's the same thing all over the university. Few people know anything about their representatives. In the case of the Board of Governor's reps, the students' union bothered on just several occasions to notify the students that there were positions open.

We, as a newspaper, accept some of the responsibility for this. But the students' union must take more pains to inform the student body about what it is doing and what it plans to do. This is called com-

munication and practically every student sitting on the students' council ran on a platform that included 'more communication'.

We believe all representatives of students must be elected on a campus-wide vote. That goes for all student councillors and all representatives on higher bodies of influence.

If this is not done, we want to hear no more talk of representative students and representative bodies or representatives of the students. And there should be even less talk of communication because, in reality, there is none.

If there were communication between the students' union and the students, why did the students need to wait for a noon hour debate to ask the president questions on CUS? Martin Loney was here for about 12 hours and he was asked a couple of questions. The president is here for a year and still, they needed answers from her that they hadn't received before. That is communication?

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| managing editor | Ronald Yakimchuk | casserole editor | Elaine Verbicky |
| news editor | Miriam McClellan | sports editor | Bill Kankewitt |
| assistant news editor | Glenn Cheriton | photo editor | Chuck Lyall |

STAFF THIS ISSUE—This issue of Gateway was pounded into shape by the following handful of loyal staffers: Terry Pettit, Ina van Nieuwerkerk, Kenneth John Bailey, Judith Samoil, Dan Carroll (a close friend of Nigel's), the Incredible Lump, lecherous ol' Nigel Fox in the flesh, Judy Griffiths, Joe Czajkowski, Knuckles P. Sandwich and a thundering herd of turtles.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

The 'myth' of Remembrance Day

By JOHN MILLER

Don't waste your money on a poppy this Remembrance Day.

I am not suggesting the money is not put to a worthy cause. The services provided by the funds, however, are a repetition of those provided by other organizations.

By the purchase of a poppy you are perpetuating and, in effect sanctioning a myth. This is the myth of the "just war" and the "honorable death."

Remembrance Day largely boils down by a big drunk for the veterans who made it back and a passing nod of recognition to the "heroes" who did not.

And who are these "war heroes" we so blithely honor? For the most part they are individuals who were brainwashed or pressured into believing they had a cause to fight for. They left their families, took a short course in efficient murder, and went on to put their lives and their families' security on the line for a cause they either didn't understand or didn't give a damn about.

Who did the brainwashing? The political leaders of the time. They were the ones who really understood the cause, and they were the ones who stayed home, snug and secure. They were fully aware that the real reason for war was to cover-up the bunglings of the politicians from 1918 on.

There is really no such thing as a "war hero." The men who collected all the medals (the army's answer to boy scout badges) were mere mortals who, when put in a difficult situation, responded instinctively and thus made a name for themselves. I

doubt very much whether any of the soldiers realized what they were getting into when they signed up. I strongly suspect most of them thought death on the battlefield was something that happened to someone else.

What about this "honorable death"? If anyone considers dying in the mud and blood of a foreign soil an honorable death, they can have it. A soldier's death is not honorable, it is a case of altruistic suicide.

The ones who survive are in a great number of instances, worse off than their buddies who didn't. There seems to be a large number who having done nothing worthwhile since the war congregate in the legions and sop up great amounts of booze, and reflect back to the war days as the "good old days." They were lousy days and anyone who says they were good is a blatant liar.

The trite old saying "They fought so that we could remain free" seems somewhat ludicrous to me. The fact is that as long as we live in a society dominated by a war-orientated psychology and economy we will never be free. We will always be shackled by the threat of war.

No one can question that Hitler had to be stopped. He could have been stopped at Munich. The indictment can't rest on Hitler alone. The political leaders from 1918 on must share the guilt. It was they who, in an outrageous demand for vengeance after the first global catastrophe, created the conditions for Hitler to rise to power.

The war years are years to forget, not remember.