



letters

five thank yours

To The Editor:

May I take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to the many persons who sacrificed time, sleep and studies last week to work on my behalf. Their teamwork and group spirit undoubtedly accounted for much of my success at the polls on Friday. Their enthusiasm and encouragement completely erased the initial doubts I had about contesting the presidency.

May I also thank U of A students for turning out in such overwhelming numbers to vote in the Students' Union general elections. I appreciate deeply the fact that so many students gave my platform their serious consideration and support.

And finally, I would like to thank my two opponents, Fraser Smith and Stan Wolanski, for contributing to a clean, hard-fought election campaign.

I hope that I will be able to live up to all your expectations.

Branny Schepanovich
law 2

To The Editor:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who worked so hard on my campaign. Without the dedicated efforts of my supporters the job would have been impossible.

The door of my office is open—anyone with any ideas about extra-curricular activities, or students' union work in general, is welcome.

Thanks again to my campaign crew.

Glenn Sinclair
arts 3

nb

did you celebrate
lucien rivard day?
do you know
the correct meaning of genocide?
do you want
tuition fees abolished?
do you
read letters?

To The Editor:

It was an interesting, if disappointing experiment. I recommend that more people try electioneering; it's hard but those who do will find a sense of pride and accomplishment in fighting for something in which they believe and in making new friends.

I would like to thank everyone who worked with me on the campaign for the faith they showed in my abilities and for their hard dedicated work for 'the cause.' They can take pleasure in the fact that, although we were severely trounced, our candidacy affected in many ways the platforms of candidates for several positions.

My biggest disappointment was the prejudice against an Engineer running for the position. Many of my colleagues in Engineering felt I was a fool. Students in other faculties told me they would not vote for an Engineer. May I make this point—the Union is not representative until any student may run for an executive position and hope to win if competent.

Well if it isn't time for a change, what time is it?

Stan Wolanski

To The Editor:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation of the efforts put forward by so many persons on my behalf in the election campaign. I would also like to congratulate the successful candidates—the students' union is in good hands.

Sincerely,
Fraser Smith

To The Editor:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the many people who worked on my campaign during the past week and all those who supported me.

I would also like to offer my sincere congratulations to Marilyn Pilkington and the rest of the new executive with best wishes for a highly successful term of office.

Thank you,
Lyanne Wilkie

franki's piles

James MacLaren,
Supervisory Consultant (first class),
Through the Editor,
The Gateway,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

I am honoured that you deem my qualifications to be of such quality that you ask me to take on the additional burden of consulting as well as supervising our new SUB. With the utmost modesty, I cannot help but agree with you that my services would indeed be valuable to you and to your fellow experts. (In each of whom I have the utmost confidence evidenced by the keen and astute observations made re the art of cat-skinning—technically sound men, all.)

As to the specific point in question viz., Franki's piles. I am afraid that you are confusing these with the anatomical variety which do occur at random. I shall not mystify our readers further with the technical aspects of pile driving, (the details of which we consultants are very familiar) for several reasons:

(a) that they would tend to con-

fuse piles for piers with haemorrhoids for the aristocracy,

(b) that the Print Shop would not be able to cope with the technical drawings which would be involved in an explanation of our technical work,

(c) that the general student body would become aware of the fact that we are not so sure of the answer anyway.

May I assure you that all such mundane and trivial tasks as Student Affairs, Foreign Student Advising, etc., will be sub-ordinated to this new and enormous burden which I have reluctantly agreed to assume.

R. C. W. Hooper
Chief Superintendent
(sidewalk division)
and Consultant

lucien rivard day

To The Editor:

Great events have been bursting around us; if we ignore them, we will be guilty of a grave oversight.

Wednesday, March 1, was Lucien Rivard Day, the first anniversary of his celebrated dashing escape from Bordeaux Jail. How many patriotic Canadians knew that? How many had not forgotten this larcenous lion whose adventures we all followed so anxiously in the press last year?

As I see it, only two men in the entire country remembered our hero faithfully enough to do something about the observation of his Day; I mean, of course, those two bold (and regrettably anonymous) gentlemen whom we all know now as speculators in gold.

What a fitting and moving tribute to the Grand Old Man of Canadian crime their action was! Can we all be so callous and apathetic as to let its significance go unrecognized?

NO! Let us join with the Canadian press and newsmen throughout the country and declare, as they do, our pride in these intrepid antisocial entrepreneurs, and show the world the magnitude of Canadian achievement!

Humbly but proudly yours,
Jim McDonald
arts 4

injustice to lapierre

To The Editor:

I feel your editorial of March 4 does an injustice to the views of Mr. LaPierre, who is unfortunately not here to defend them. Since I was present when the interview on which

you based your editorial took place, I feel qualified to reply. Mr. LaPierre is given to a flamboyant overstatement of his views which makes his statements excellent fuel for flaming editorials. Mr. LaPierre finds this university frightening because it is part of a province where intellectualism has been known to be denounced by prominent government figures. His view is not unlike that of various cartoons of a Manning-sun shrivelling flowers which appeared in The Gateway last year. Surely you will agree there is an anti-intellectualism in Alberta which many find frightening.

Secondly, what Mr. LaPierre said was not that he would not come to this university even if especially asked, but that he would not come to this university to speak if asked by the administration. He finds a university where an issue like the Williamson-Murray one can arise frightening.

I think, too, that you should have noted his views about a frightening university did not apply to the students, whom he complimented for attempting to deal actively with the problem of Canada, even though he felt a teach-in was not the answer.

Mr. LaPierre was not speaking of the number of buildings we have built, nor the merits of the Golden Bears, but rather was concerned with what goes inside the buildings, and who teaches the football players off the field. He is concerned with an attitude which he thinks exists here. Although flamboyantly stated, his views aren't that significantly different from those of The Gateway, and by leaping on the most sensational bits of them, and launching your attack on him, you are guilty of the same crime. Is something wrong with his views because they come from the east?

D. B. Wilson
arts 2

correspondent wanted

Dear Sir:

I beg your pardon because I will take your valuable time. I want to correspond with a Canadian University student (preferably girl student). It is desired that the ages of girls is between 18-21. If can you supply me few addresses, I will be glad.

Very truly yours
Atilla Isik Ozkaynak
3. year student, Technical
University of Istanbul,
Electrical Faculty

the correct meaning

accomplices in genocide

To The Editor:

I am very hesitant to interfere in student politics, but I do feel that when words are used in a way that is directly contrary to their meaning in order, because of their emotive impact, to achieve a specific objective a correction is required.

Since the teach-in on Vietnam my position on this matter is probably well-known, but in case it is not I would point out that I cannot approve of the present policy of the United States, let alone the means by which it is seeking to achieve its ends in Asia.

A poster currently being displayed in the University asserts that "we have become accomplices in Genocide." This asseration indicates that those responsible for the propaganda underlying the poster are completely unaware of the nature of genocide.

It was not until 1948, when the General Assembly adopted its famous resolution on the subject in the form of a Convention, that Genocide was carefully defined and elevated out of the arena of emotion into that of law. By the Convention, genocide is defined as:

"acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such: [by]

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent birth within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group" (blackface added).

The essential feature of genocide is that it should be resorted to against an identifiable group with the avowed intention of destroying that group as a group and because of its characteristics as a group.

It is perfectly true that the result of the present American bombing campaign in Vietnam is to destroy civilian Vietnamese. It is also true that the campaign is directed against identifiable groups known as Viet Cong, National Liberation Front, Communists, or North Vietnamese. It is by no means clear, however, that it is directed against any of these groups solely with the intention of destroying them as groups.

A war, civil or otherwise, is being fought in Vietnam and the bombing is part of this war. Even if it be true, as the London Times suggests,

that the result of the bombing will be to return Vietnam to the Stone Age this does not make it genocide.

To apply the term genocide to this situation would be to authorize attachment of this to the acts of any belligerent in any war, for it may well be argued that the purpose of the belligerent is to destroy its enemy. Its purpose, however, is not normally to effect their total extermination other than for the purpose of achieving victory.

Many of us may feel that some of the activities on both sides in the Vietnamese war constitute war crimes. Some of us may even feel that the National Liberation front is also seeking to destroy its enemies. However, both sides are engaged in hostilities for political reasons and it would be difficult to contend that either of them is seeking to destroy a group as such.

If genocide had not become a technical term of international law, one might not be quite so opposed to its loose use in the present situation. Since it has such a technical use, however, those seeking support for their policy should have sufficient honesty to use it in its correct way and not rely upon the emotional appeal it will have to delude those unaware of its meaning.

Yours truly,
L. C. Green, Professor

Viewpoint

The current cry for the abolition of tuition fees has so far been met with few arguments other than that the University (or, more correctly, the Province) cannot afford it. This tenet is obviously not valid, but it is supplemented by arguments of much greater and more lasting significance as yet have scarcely been recognized. These arguments raise the question of the student's very status on this campus.

I have heard it suggested that it is unfair for the government to bear the cost of tuition for the first twelve years of a student's education, and then to abandon it altogether after he enters university. This supposition completely ignores the fundamental difference between a school and a university. Under the present system a university student can make the claim, as one candidate recently did, 'that we should be given every opportunity to express the student's point of view on subjects which directly involve him.' Take away tuition fees, and you take away this right of expression.

by
terence
donnelly

This university is a place where students have come, of their own initiative, to learn under the guidance of men of knowledge. We have paid for this privilege. Consequently, we have the right to demand certain teaching standards, and also the right to voice an opinion in administrative matters—tenure cases, for example.

In a completely state-financed university, on the other hand, any dissent or dissatisfaction on the part of the student body can be quelled by the simple and very true argument, "You're getting it free, so you can like it or lump it."

The status of a student in a free university is no longer that of a paying customer who has the right to demand service; rather, it is that of a government-owned worker who must gobble up a formula education doled out by civil servants.

I am not suggesting that students should bear any more of the cost of running this university than they presently do. I would not even be adverse to the idea of seeing tuition fees substantially reduced, and certainly I welcome additional financial assistance from the government. But we must always retain the act of paying tuition, for it is the only thing which gives us the present enviable status which we now hold as university students.

Terence Donnelly is a second year arts student.