nazis

Tolerance is a concept that when practiced helps civilized people live more comfortably with each other. Unfortunately tolerance is in short supply on the Dalhousie campus these days.

Several weeks ago the Gazette office received a phone call from a person who wished to remain nameless but who had been subjected to an obnoxious stream of verbal abuse from a representative of a Dalhousie organization. The person was a homosexual who had called this organization to seek information on where he could make contacts with others like himself. He had no desire to impose his values or preferences on those who did not feel the same way he did but instead of receiving simply the information he asked for he was given a long harangue on "perverts" and "queers" and how they should all be locked up or worse. The anonymous caller was not from Halifax and knew nothing about Dalhousie or the persons who answer telephones in the Student Union Building. He merely thought that since this was a University he would be treated sympathetically and with tolerance. He was obviously operating under the misapprehension that university students are somewhat more enlightened than they actually are.

It appears to us that University students are less tolerant than other identifiable groups within our society but that may be only because we are presently living within the University community. Of course students are not the only ones within this so called "elite" community. The faculty and administrators of Dalhousie are equally at fault but they have learned to hide it better and practice their intolerance more subtly. What bothers us is that rather than trying to eradicate the more undesirable aspects of human nature our "elders" are often only teaching us to practice

A university should provide a community in which the differences or the eccentricites of human beings can thrive or at the very least be tolerated. Instead what seems to be happening at Dalhousie is that differences between people are looked askance at — are, in fact, considered undesirable. Heaven forbid that any student or faculty member here should exhibit signs of individuality or differences from the herd. Those who do attempt to follow there own instincts are permitted to do so only as long as it does not interfere with the herd. When faced with a different or unique personality within the group the group isolates, classifies and often attempts to annihilate the individual at fault. Tolerance

for and appreciation of the "different" person is unthinkable. Intolerance when pushed to extremes results in situations like those found in Nazi Germany. Certainly we do not think that Dalhousie students or faculty would advocate murder for those among us who are marching to different drummers. What happens is much simpler and more bloodless — the offender is either trained into submission or expelled from the group. It's much pleasanter and more civilized that way. But then as we started out to say tolerance should be an integral part of our civilization.

Canada's Oldest College Newspaper
The Dalhousie GAZETTE is the weekly publication of the Dalhousie Student Union. The views expressed in the paper are not necessarily those of the Student Union, the university administration, the editor, or the staff. We reserve the right to edit or delete copy for space or legal reasons. Deadline date for letters to the GAZETTE and outside contributions is Friday preceeding publications. No anonymous material will be accepted, but names may be withheld on request if there are extenuating circumstances. The Dalhousie GAZETTE is a founding member of Canadian University Press.

Editor:

Mary Pat MacKenzie

Editor: Mary Pat MacKenzie
Circulation Manager
Managing Editor: Rick Whitby
News Editor Ron Norman
CUP Editor Michael Greenfield
Room 334, Student Union Building
Subscription Rates: \$5.00 per year [26 issues]

This issue's staff and contributors:

Alexia Barnes
Dona Bulgin
Stephen Campbell
Dave Chadee
Kamal Chopra
L. Daye
Joel Fournier
Marguerita Hoyd
B. Kamperman
Roger Metcalf

Brian Miller
Nancy Miller
D. Moulton
Kevin Moore
Chris Neilsen
Dan O'Connor
Nancy Orr
Judy Snider
Helen Spinelli
Mark Teehan



Union Fees

To the Gazette:

If I might take up a little more of your space to reply to Dan O'Connor's letter I would be grateful.

First — I am glad that Dan agrees that the analogy between city taxes and Union fees is a poor one. The analogy was put forward by a student union representative, not by me, and the purpose of my previous letter was to point out the weakness of this analogy, which perhaps I did not do very well.

Second — on my comments on opting out Dan says that "Many people can and do participate in the Union without entering the S.U.B." etc. I can hardly agree with that statement, but I might ask "How many?"

Apparently my statements on this reflect "insufficient knowledge" about people doing nothing but paying the compulsory fee. I based this remark on the following information:

the following information: However, not all of the ills that have befallen the Student Union have been result of inept student leadership. Much of the blame for student apathy must lie with the university administration, its poor planning, and - regretably with the students themselves...Dalhousie takes on all the atmosphere of a high school, and an extremely impersonal one at that. The students of this university have historically contributed to this atmosphere by continuing to fraternize with their high school comrades confining their university experience to one of attending classes and getting out as quickly as possible." The source of this "insufficient knowledge" is the Student Handbook to which Dan himself contributed.

Referring Dan to the last Gazette, page eight, "One of the major criticisms students have about the University is the problem of student apathy. The Gazette regularly publishes editorials on student apathy

Referring Dan to the front page of the last Gazette we learn that Russell and Smiley will represent us next year having amassed 16% of the total possible vote, all

Pres/V-P hopefuls together getting the "relatively low" figure of 25% of the possible turnout, and on page three we notice Grad. Studies, Dents, Nurses, Health Professions and Meds Council seats were filled by acclamation. (So much for bringing the Union to the Carleton Campus).

It seems to me that not many people participate extensively etc., etc. and that just as many, if not more, do not participate at all, if one is to believe the official organs of information of the Union. Of course, everyone knows that there is massive student disinterest here and to argue otherwise is to argue in the teeth of the facts. I am not saying that disinterest is a good thing, but to deny its existence and pretend that everything is A.O.K. does not help.

Third - it is interesting that Dan mentions that a majority at a referendum is required for any change in the compulsory fee. Referring to my Student Handbook By-Law VIII(i) states any change in this fee shall require the sanction of a simple majority of those voting at the Student Union meeting held during the academic year ... Now when was the meeting held to vote on the recent fee increase or was the referendum a substitute for this? If so, is this legal? Furthermore, how can you get a simple majority against an increase from a preferential ballot on which three choices out of four were for an increase, and why was not there an opportunity to vote for a decrease? I guess all of these questions have been raised before but no convincing answers have been forthcoming.

Fourth - on restriction of Council privileges I am glad to hear that these have been reduced and look forward to the day when Council members will feel that their function is to represent their constituents and not to feed off them.

My chief objection to the way in which the Union is run stems from the need for the recent fee increase. There is no doubt that there is a great deal of disinterest in the Union in this university, and to glibly say that anyone who wants to

cont'd on pg 5