

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief Al Scarth

managing editor Ginny Bax sports editor Joe Czajkowski
news editors Sid Stephen, photo editor Dave Hebditch
Peggi Selby, Dan Jamieson

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Among the gigglepussies padding around the awface were weird weird Joe (who showed Barbara through the men's can), Terry Malanchuk (who puts up with everyone), Barry Carter, Jimofthesamename, Dave Hebditch, Cathey More-is, Dan (the panther danther), Dorothy (oh no—not a) Constable, Winston Giggleyuk, Sandie Bethie Wintering hams, and your Giggling garter of the golden garbage garrison, Harvey G. Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline for Tuesday edition—6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Thursday prior; for Thursday edition—6 p.m. Wednesday, Advertising noon Monday prior; for Friday edition—6 p.m. Thursday, Advertising—noon Tuesday prior; Casserole—copy deadline 6 p.m. Monday, Advertising—noon Friday prior. Short Shorts deadline, 3 p.m. day prior to publication. Advertising manager Percy Wickman, 432-4241. Office phones 432-5168, 432-5178. Circulation—15,000. Circulation manager Brian MacDonald.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1969

Hidden witch hunters are at U of A too

By Al Scarth

There was a time when they burned witches for practising the devil's art.

There was a time when they burned books for preaching his word.

And with every witch and every book that provided fabric for the flame, they burned a little bit of the truth.

They don't call it the devil's art or the devil's word anymore.

They are more "civilized" than that.

But they are still burning.

The reasons for the burnings are two-fold: either the murderers disagree with what the witches and the books say or they don't understand it.

Whether they hide their witch hunts under such disguises as "bad taste" or "inappropriate" or "de-meaning to the image of the university", they are still witch hunting.

Vice-president Tyndall is a witch hunter. As surely as touching the first torch to the foot of the stake, he took it upon himself to drive the devil from the soul of the university, or its "image".

The devil in this case was a cartoon which used the most powerful imagery this hung-up society has to confront it with a truth about Vietnam.

"Why, they were, well, you know, I mean, gee—they were doing it."

And that, as Vice-president Tyndall would say, is just not something to be portrayed in a university publication.

"Why, it was, well, you know, I mean, gee—it was in bad taste."

But he wouldn't dream of censoring it, oh no; You can get it printed somewhere else, if you wish. In fact, we'd rather not have anything to do with The Gateway at all, thank you.

The crucial point here is that Vice-president Tyndall does not believe printing services should serve the students, the major reason for this university's existence. He believes, rather, it should serve the "image of the university."

He wouldn't want to risk the fortunes of the university's massive capital fund drive by letting it leak out that students could say what they pleased through University Printing Services.

"Why, that could mean, well, you know, I mean, gee—their parents might see it and where would the money come from?"

It was censorship, Dr. Tyndall—pure and simple, for the sake of the image.

What is worse, you washed your hands of the responsibility to support a free press. We remember a Biblical administrator who did almost the same thing.

Did something happen, or was true light stamped out in moratorium cold

"Civic duty and love for your fellowmen," they said. So I went to your moratorium. And I sat through your arguments. And I was grabbed by the idea of imperialism being the root of all evil, and that peace is or is not (I can't remember which) a state of mind, and that Communists are baddies. Inspired by your rhetoric, I even went to your demonstration. It was fun trampling through the snow down Jasper Avenue, watching the spectators blow their minds over us long-haired radicals. Then, in Churchill Square, I saw the True Light, stamping my cold feet in the snow, listening to Effie Woloshyn, and hating the anti-Communist demonstrators burning up Ho Chi Minh's effigy.

Now it's all over. And I still wrap my sandwiches with Dow Chemical's saran wrap. And I still attend classes. And I still am looking for a summer job to help pay for another year of university. So what about the war in Vietnam, the plight of the Indians in Canada, the discrimination in our beet fields? So what?

The True Light had burnt out in the night.

Lily Mah Sen
arts 2

I don't doubt that the cynics and the pessimists will be airing their views on the Vietnam moratorium. I am so tired of the jeers and the

Obscene words vs "Pamella"

I also am interested in more modernization, quicker changes for the better in all facets of our "beloved U of A" but there is one question that I have to ask you—are so many four letter words necessary? Sure—vehement language has its shock or awakening value, but why can't we keep our language clean and not pollute it with uncouth words!

On the other hand, though the censors have "charmingly censored certain cartoons that the mature mind would understand and appreciate the humor of, then why not ban certain books such as "Moll Flanders," "Pamella," "Tristram Shandy" as taught in our English courses? Surely sexual allusions are not that "evil," "bad," "wicked" to the intelligent 20th century university student.

Illa Shingadia

sneers that accompany any effort to take a stand on an important issue. No wonder people sink into apathy after such discouragement. Cynicism seems to be the U of A fashion; people pride themselves on being realists while looking with disdain or indifference on the "foolish idealists." Well, hear the puny cry of a cock-eyed idealist.

I think Saturday's escapade did something. Some of the people marching in that parade were firmly against the war. Some were luke-warmly opposed. Some were anti-American, some were anti-Communist and others were anti-Trudeau. There were also a great many neutrals out for a good time. It was a motley assortment, but I think we at least came out of our apathetic shells and showed an interest in something.

Too many people judge effectiveness by immediate results. They are afflicted with a near-sightedness that fails to see the future consequences of a mounting public pressure against the atrocities of the Vietnamese war. They are skeptics who look at the Edmonton moratorium forgetting that it was a mere fraction of a whole world-wide movement. Therein lies our importance. Fractions may be insignificant, but a whole can be quite formidable. The negativists fail to realize that public opinion must be exerted again and again and again before it gets anywhere.

Let the cynics laugh. I've never known negative thinking to accomplish anything.

Marcia Howey
ars 3

Dear Dennis Zomerschoe:

Re: Your personal case of diarrhea.

The Vietnamese people have been trying since the end of WW II to rid themselves of domination by a foreign power. In the early attempts, under Ho Chi Minh's leadership, they were trying to get

rid of the French—which they finally did at Dien Bien Phu. When Ho Chi Minh was writing the new constitution for a free Vietnam he was strongly under the influence of American democratic principles and used parts of the American Declaration of Independence. He must feel peculiarly betrayed and bewildered by the American move in the 50's to pick up where France had failed; the domination of his country by an outside power.

I believe America went into this war at a time when she was highly (just slightly more than at present) paranoid of a communist Asia developing under Chinese influence. That is an illogical, unfounded fear. Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and all the rest want to be free—of all domination. They are forced to rely on Chinese assistance because they are too small to resist a country as powerful as the United States. The Chinese are really far too poor and busy with their own internal conflicts to be of great assistance, and because of that fact, we must salute the Vietnamese who have valiantly and fairly successfully kept the United States forces at bay.

By what right to you think the Americans should have "influence" in Asia? What have they ever done for any underdeveloped country that entitles them to hold "influence"? These Asian countries have every right to freedom and self-influence that any other country has. The United States should get out and let the Vietnamese settle their internal problems themselves.

P. Swanson
grad st 1

P.S.—I truly apologize to those people who are more articulate and informed critics of the U.S. policy in Vietnam, but I was afraid that you would let Mr. Zomerschoe have the last word at this time.

How do we get involved to change our world?

Your editorial in the Thursday, Nov. 13 edition prompted me to drop a comment.

In this you plead and verily beg

for comment to your writing or to that of your paper. You urge people to participate, to think, and above all to do something. Then in the Friday, Nov. 14 issue of the Casserole, under the title "Editors Diatribe," can be possibly found the answer to the seeming indifference. Here we are told something that I am sure most of us have realized for a very long time, that there is nothing that you or I can really do to change the system of things as they are going to happen. Decisions or non-decisions are made by people and organizations so far removed from us as to be in another world. So why should we get involved, or is what I'm trying to say is how should we get involved? Who do you talk to? And who needs more talk anyway. We have all heard and read repeatedly about the problems, but who does anything about them. Even protest marches and placard carrying, who listens? Who changes policy because of them?

And so we remain silent, perhaps not in agreement with what is going on in the world around us, but with the feeling of powerlessness to act.

An interested reader of your campus papers, and especially your editorial comments. Don't stop.

Bert I.
12237 - 102 St.

Day care and Ellen Singleton defended by council Arts rep

I am ashamed that a fellow arts student of mine (Tom Peterson—Gateway letter Nov. 18) has such a selfish viewpoint as pointed out in his reply to Ellen Singleton's letter.

In the first place Ellen is not married.

Ellen cares like the majority of student council representatives that the one in five students on this campus that are married should have adequate care supplied for their children.

If you suggest that you or Bill Farion do not want to support the needs of other people then I suggest you drop out of university and take a job as one of the underpaid workers in our society. In our society all you have to do is earn under \$1,100 and you won't have to pay income tax for someone who wants "something for nothing."

By the way I also suggest you quickly pay back your student's

assistance. After all a lot of workers with five or six kids, earning only about \$3,000 a year, are paying for your "equal opportunity for an education."

Why not work as a laborer until you retire at age 65? Then maybe you'll have earned your equal opportunity for an education. In your own words.

"Equality of opportunity presupposes equality before that opportunity. People who want to have their cake and eat it too surely cannot be treated equally with those who do not entertain this irrational desire."

I have one more thing to say Tom and Bill. I am quite willing to pay for Day Care Centre facilities when you and your future wives have three infant children and are trying to continue your education and are still trying to pay off your student loans.

Brian MacDonald
arts rep