

## Student Discipline

There are three views concerning student discipline: that of the authorities, that of the students, and that of the public. The public's ideas are known to us all only too well—a firm incorrigible belief that Varsity boys are a harum-scarum lot, who must be put down and kept in their place by a penal system of punishment. The public are quite content that they are right and always will be. The faculty are almost as firmly convinced that their system is at least as good as any that can be obtained considering the circumstances, while we, knowing both are wrong, are merely waiting to be called on to set matters right. Undoubtedly our time will come in another twenty or thirty years.

An examination of the many rules which preserve our well-being and the hurdling of which build strong characters accustomed to overcoming difficulties, shows clearly how the authorities think we should be governed.

### Liquor in Residence

This is one of the latest regulations that has been passed—an absolute prohibition of having any intoxicant in Residence. We say nothing of the system by which this ruling is enforced, for it is undoubtedly as good as any that might be devised. Editorials have been written before on whether it is properly a question for the University, its moral significance and its educational value, but we are concerned with none of these. It is one of those rules they may be observed to the letter but never in the spirit, and we do not believe that the University authorities are laboring under the profound misapprehension that they have decreased drinking among students. The rule was motivated, we believe, entirely by public policy, and we cannot see that it usefully serves any other purpose. In fact, now that a student cannot keep liquor in his room and learn how to drink it properly, he is forced to go overtown, where he tends to drink in a hurry, and the result may be most lamentable.

### "No Smoking Allowed in the Halls"

We are told the reason for this ruling is that it is thought it is not fitting that students should be allowed to smoke in an administrative building. We suppose it can be put down to a question of taste. The ruling in our eyes certainly lacks usefulness, and the irritation it has caused is unjustifiable from the viewpoint of the primary purposes of student discipline.

### Sunday Observance

The rules requiring the outward manifestations of Christianity come to a sudden end at 12 o'clock noon, and as most students take advantage of their one free morning in the week to sleep, we do not think these rules inconvenience many. Hockey or tennis Sunday morning is not allowed, and this seems to be the sum total of the prohibitions. Perhaps these things do help raise the grant from the Legislature.

### Parties Overtown

All parties, dances or any University function must be held on University territory. The purpose of this ruling may be either internal or external policy; it is impossible to say. Two places are open for parties whether they be parties open to all students or just faculty or club dances—Athabasca Hall and St. Joseph's are the spots. Neither of these places are of the best to hold small parties, so if the rule was observed strictly club parties would be practically out of the question. This, however, has become another case of the rule being observed to the letter, but not in the spirit. We can hardly expect University students to stop going to overtown parties.

We have dealt only with the rules that are embodied in definite rulings; there are others more in the nature of understanding. To the latter there seem to be very few objections, and the student, although he knows he must obey them, is not met at every turn by a notice or sign calling them

to his attention. This, in our opinion, is a much better way of handling student discipline than in enacting masses of written rules, to find which we are referred to page such and such in the calendar.

The worst feature of many of these rules is that there isn't any hope of them ever being followed. Student activities are buy plunged underground, and the authorities if they wish to know what the students are doing, must ferret. A very unfortunate position for any person to occupy. Again, this publicly-dictated maternalism cannot but tend to destroy student initiative and place a premium on being a book-worm. True, they are not aimed, with one possible exception, at the intellectual freedom of the students, but they cannot help but react in this field. They will undoubtedly in time enervate student life, for a university is certainly more than a matter of attending class.

The majority of these rulings have been put in force in recent times. The students wake up to find there is another rule governing them. They are not given any reasons why these rules are enforced, nor is it at all apparent why some of them should be. Criticisms are made of them, but they all go unanswered.

Jan. 18/35

## Improving Beauty

To the Editor:

Since the entrance to the Arts Building is one of the few spots on the University Campus with some architectural beauty and dignity, it is a pity that a dust bin should stand permanently in front of the door. Could it be removed?

—A Student.

Nov. 8/46.

## Come on Girls!

Dear Sir, - Girls now attending our universities must have plenty of what it takes or they've had it. They must study like veterans, every one must be a ravishing beauty, and now they must be excellent dressers.

This clash of western beauty queens should be good, and I'm looking for Alberta to win. No doubt everyone will enjoy the show very much, but where did U. of T. get the price of admission? Why do girls attend this Toronto school if they possess this clear superiority? Are their fees remitted so the campus will be glorified? Or is this declaration of Toronto's another proff of the Village Pump inferiority complex?

Come on, Alberta girls, sport down to Toronto and take that beauty crown hands down.

Yours Truly,  
"CAMPUS VETERAN."

Nov. 6, 1946.

## No Smoking

The Editor.

Dear Sir: Your editorial with reference to letters to The Editor is a timely one and while it may be true that the absence of letters denotes an apathy on the part of the students, I believe there is also room for the opinion that it is not so much apathy as it is the fact that the University possesses a High School complex. This I feel is reflected by the reaction to your editorial re the American Air Base.

Further in this contention I would refer to the regulations governing the Cafeteria. The fact that it must be closed during certain hours is admittedly a phase of the present shortages both of labour and materials and cannot be helped. There is in addition the contentious question of the "No Smoking" rule. This is, I submit, not endorsed by five percent of the student body although it is now being enforced by a uniformed policeman who derived his authority, so the policeman tells me, from the president of the university.

For the students who use the cafeteria it is in many cases the only available accommodation. I feel that if an analysis were made of those who wish the "No Smoking" rule to be enforced it would be revealed that a good proportion of them have a home of their own to go to if they wished to prepare a meal there. Prohibition in the United States failed because the majority of the people were not in favour of the law. Good law should always reflect the will of the people not the opinion of a few. It is time that this particular regulation is either put to a vote for student endorsement or that the students like the people of the United States show by their collective action that they are not in favour of the rule.

Yours very truly,  
Bill Rorke.  
Nov. 8/46

## Advertising

Editor, The Gateway.

Dear Sir,—"What this University needs is advertising—favorable advertising which will appeal to the public and make that same public realize that it has in their great University a real centre of learning and culture." Our beloved Taurus in his excellent article from which this is quoted, neglected only to disclose that the University's most widely effective advertising is the department of its students.

At least twice have several mannerly Freshmen been shocked by the astonishing conduct of their generally respected seniors, these occasions being the Open Forum debates.

Each innocent Freshman had been taught at his mother's knee what to do and what not to do. He must doff his hat to a

lady or be thought rude. He must be considerate and speak in a well modulated voice. He must always be gentlemanly.

It was a surprise to these new arrivals at the Open Forum debate to see respectable gentlemen smoking without the consent of the ladies present. Surprising also was the impoliteness with which the debaters addressed each other and the chair. But when the Speaker proceeded to exhale clouds of smoke which dimmed the lights and then demanded obedience to the rules of debate, these Freshies were thoroughly astonished.

Authorities on etiquette are always careful to point out that polite people do not converse upon certain subjects in public. But when a prominent debater, after having accused an opponent of all manner of weaknesses, proceeded to hint about illegitimacy of birth, it was just too much.

These seniors of the Open Forum should be warned about the ill results of such conduct. Perhaps our President or our Provost could enlighten them on matters of behavior. Or perhaps our Freshmen could establish an advisory committee on etiquette to advise these ill-mannered students.

A FRESHMAN

Nov. 10/33

## Pot Pourri

Peregrinating Percival the Pertinacious Renews an Ancient Column — Still Another Vagabondage Through News, Views and Booze.

By Percival Hodnut

If the appearance, or reappearance, of this column is to be remarkable for any feature, it will undoubtedly be so for the editor's partial agreement with "F. P. Mac" on the Flanders' Poppy question. When one agrees so seldom with him, either wholly or in part, one's column and one's self must be remarkable, mustn't it and mustn't one's self? Darn tootin', as the Anti-Saxophone League says.

Opium For the People

Poppy making gives employment to quite a number of men who would otherwise have little to do, and in these times that is considered a justification for any occupation—except speech-making against the "Old-Line" political parties. So we'd better hang onto poppies for a while.

As for the two minutes of silence: they can be profitably used (after broadcasting the right propaganda) in praying that we shall never let ourselves be taken in by arguments purporting to present a case for butchery "in defense of king, country, freedom, etc." as those who die during 1914-18 were. "F.P. Mac" was callous to the suffering caused those who lost sons, brothers, sweethearts in the war: with that attitude we cannot sympathize. But, likewise, we cannot sympathize with the "duty" sentiment expressed by a Gateway correspondent. It is easy to preach the doctrine that our side fought that democracy might live, for defense of home and country, etc., etc. Exploitation of belief in the doctrine is even easier. Frankly, we're fed up on "cultured" countries which allow Hitlers, gangsters, politicians, morons, munition trusts and general staffs to pull down the civilization which seemed to have earmarks or progress. Relevant in this connection is a woman's remark to the effect that it is surprising how many boobs we elect to public office. She added that there was comfort to be found in the thought that if elections were held oftener we'd elect more of them. True, lady.

Nov. 17/33

## The Gay Outlook

by Peter Gay

Columnist for the University of Denver "Clarion"

Last week I emphasized that we should turn the atom bomb over to the United Nations Organization for purely selfish reasons. The scientists who worked on the bomb are now making themselves heard, and are saying the same: Dr. Oppenheimer for one has admitted that one atom bomb raid could wipe out forty million Americans overnight.

But there is another reason for the attitude advanced in these columns: at San Francisco, the United Nations created a world organization. The nations sharing in the secret of the bomb—the U.S., Canada and Great Britain—were among the leading powers supporting the Charter. Are we ready to place faith in that organization—are we willing to give it the responsibility of controlling the most dangerous weapon in the history of mankind?

It is unfortunate that we seem unwilling to accept the inevitable consequences of recent history. Men who demand a large army and navy for the United States belong in that category: they may be completely sincere, but they are thinking in terms of the past; the hard facts of the atomic age have made our total military thinking obsolete. A similar situation exists in international affairs: at San Francisco we talked of international co-operation, yet when something comes along that makes co-operation more imperative than ever, we drag the red herring of distrust across the scene, and raise the venerable (if outmoded) flag of national sovereignty. Recent events have made the San Francisco Charter obsolete, but we seem unwilling to go even the minimum lengths that the Charter prescribes.

As I have suggested before, clear thinking and bold actions alone can save us. It matters little today whether we prefer absolute national sovereignty to world union; to deny the crying need for world union is to deny the very existence of the atom bomb—no

less. It is true, of course, that absolute national sovereignty was a hollow myth even before August, 6, 1945. But previous to that date, the men who advocated a world federation were considered dreamers. Such men were right all along, of course; the advent of the atom bomb has proved their position to be hard-headed realism rather than mushy idealism.

But the significance of world federation has changed: it is no longer a dream in the minds of a few advanced thinkers—it has become an urgent necessity. You may like the idea of a world federation in which each nation exercises but limited sovereignty—if so, you can enter the fight for it with the spirit that will be needed to put it over. But if you should be opposed to it, you should become convinced that no matter what your feelings on the subject, nothing less will do. "The future of humanity hinges on the creating of a world federation," that is not a wild-eyed, dramatic statement; it is more of an obvious truism.

The challenge to students is an immense one: the need for true world statesmanship has never been greater than today, and the United States, which has exercised world leadership before should do so again. Rather than being drugged by events, we in the New Work should take the lead, and thus help to banish wars. The work offers almost impossible obstacles, but we are driven by a terrible urgency that will not allow us to fail. As I have pointed out before, there are multitudinous ways in which we can work toward the aim of world federation, but no matter what we do, we must keep that aim steadily in mind. Look around you, and you will discover evidence on every hand that this world had become too small to support the institution of the absolute sovereign nation-state. The atom bomb was only the final reminder that for mankind the choice lies in the unity of a world federation or total destruction.

Oct. 19/45