

Marijuana — part two

III. Marijuana and Crime:

The general view by authorities is there is no connection. Saltzman states that the idea of "dope fiends" bent on murder and rape is a myth. He finds most marijuana users prefer a quiet, stable environment. He also concludes it is erroneous to believe marijuana leads to sex orgies, etc. The LaGuardia committee also found no association between marijuana and aggressive crime. Dr. Moraes Andrade, analysing psychiatric findings on 120 persons referred by courts for examination on suspicion of having committed a crime under influence of marijuana, found no evidence that marijuana caused or incited the criminal action. Concerning marijuana and crime, Dr. L. Kolb, a noted authority, states: "The tendency to credit a narcotic as the cause of physical, mental and social disorders is so great in the U.S., that marijuana-induced crimes are often reported in the press and by police-trained people, when there is no causal relation of marijuana to the crime".

IV. Marijuana and Heroin:

The most vigorous, untiring enemy of marijuana, Commissioner Anslinger of the U.S. Narcotics Bureau, is quoted in Congress (1937):

Rep. Dingwall: "I am just wondering whether the marijuana addict graduates into a heroin, opium, or cocaine user?" Anslinger: "No sir, I have not heard of a case of that kind. I think it is an entirely different class. The marijuana addict does not go in that direction."

This lack of connection is strengthened by the fact that in India and Morocco where marijuana use is widespread, there are very few opiate users, and no social connection is seen between the two types of drugs.

In Canada: "The Narcotic Addiction Foundation of B.C. is concerned whether or not the use of marijuana in Vancouver might eventually lead to use of heroin. The pattern till now has been that heroin addicts started their road to addiction via alcohol or barbiturates or both. Many used heroin as a first drug. Rarely did we see a patient who had smoked marijuana previous to the use of heroin."

Dr. Carl Bowman, past presi-

dent of the American Psychopathological Assoc., concludes in the Samuel Hamilton Memorial Lecture that marijuana is a rather unimportant drug, with psychological effects much like alcohol, involving no true physiological addiction and comparatively little psychological dependence . . .

"Actually, alcohol is a much more common precursor of heroin addiction than marijuana".

V. Marijuana and Alcohol:

Dr. A. Lindesmith, one of the foremost investigators in the field, concludes: "Marijuana is less dangerous and less harmful to the human body than is alcohol. It is, for example, not habituating". Dr. Schur, in *Crimes Without Victims*, states: "Social approval of alcohol exists on the face of the well-known dangers of excessive drinking. Many experts insist that conditions of alcoholism are far more harmful to the individual than is opiate addiction (let alone marijuana usage). The unhappy lessons of the prohibition experiment point up the key role negative social sanctions on drug use any play in creating secondary problems." And Mr. W. Eldridge, in his official study for the American Bar Foundation, states: "Nothing has proved that marijuana in itself is a serious danger to the physical well-being of the user, or to the social well-being of the community . . . Alcohol presents a . . . problem of greater magnitude."

VI. Marijuana and the Law:

Since marijuana is limited by severe legal penalties, a user must participate in a group thru which supplies are available to him, ordinarily a group organized around values and activities opposing those of the larger conventional society. This reinforces his anti-social tendencies. Laws against marijuana have several unfortunate consequences: The illegal nature of the drug makes it especially attractive to those who are most likely to be damaged by it; the effects of jailing on employment, school, and family, often result in the reinforcement of anti-social attitudes; available marijuana may contain dangerous impurities; the law does not stop marijuana distribution and must resort to use of informers or stool pigeons.

—The Committee to
Legalize Marijuana

This is page FIVE

Yes, this is a great society. It has to be to allow people to say what they are thinking before they have thought about it.

The second and final part of Bernard Bloom's marijuana paper is here and it has some strange company. There is a letter from the revived campus Socreds, a letter concerning election day and then there is Peter Boothroyd's column. Peter continues his education theme this week.

Bring letters to 282 SUB or mail to The Editor, The Gateway etc. Keep them less than 300 words. We could also use cartoons.

—The Editor

An attempt to cast a ballot

Dear Sir,

I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the present system of enumerating and voting in the City of Edmonton. At the present time I am residing in Henday Hall, one of the university residences, as I have been for the past 12 months with the exception of the summer recess. It is my understanding (re Gateway Volume 59 Issue 14 Page 3) that any person 19 years of age who has resided in the city for 12 months is eligible to vote and that temporary absence from the city does not result in the cancellation of a person's franchise. I found that my name had not been included on the voter's list but that the majority of students living in the complex and meeting the above requirements had been enumerated.

Being a strong believer in the democratic process I went to a nearby polling station to be sworn in so that I could participate in the running of this city. I was refused this right and was told I was not eligible because I had not been a resident of Edmonton for 12 consecutive months. Still wishing to use the franchise that was "supposedly" available to me I went to city hall to make further inquiries and after a short and cordial discussion I was directed to the election centre.

Nearly two hours after my ini-

tial inquiry I proceeded to the election centre and for the third time explained my predicament. For the same reason as was previously mentioned I was refused my franchise and was told I was not truly interested in the election; all this adding insult to injury. A "gentleman" working in the office then came over to me, pounded his fist on the desk and ordered me to be silent. Despite my attempts to discuss the situation in a quiet and intelligent manner he made no attempt to explain the matter and curtly asked me if I was ready to leave. Truly democratic I left totally disillusioned and wondering if it was really worth voting if the opportunity arose again.

Is this how the democratic process is carried on in Edmonton? Why were the election officials not ready to discuss the matter with me. Was it that they were the ones who did not know the requirements to be met? I am most concerned about the whole issue and strongly feel that something should be done to rectify the situation.

If this is the type of "encouragement" given to the citizens of Edmonton it is not surprising that there was only a disgraceful 39 per cent turnout at the polls on election day.

Tom Brown
Engineering II

Socreds are alive!

The Editor,

Contrary to the statement which appeared in a recent Gateway editorial on model parliament, the campus Socreds are neither dead nor seeking a new university leader. We are at present engaged in a matter of vital concern and importance not only to ourselves but to the people of Alberta as a whole—that of choosing the man who is best suited and best equipped to be premier of the province.

Consequently, to provide the university audience with an opportunity to see for themselves what the Social Credit party has to offer, and to evaluate those who have at this time declared their candidacy for the leadership, the campus Socreds are holding a forum in TL-11 of the Tory building today at 8 p.m.

Anyone interested in the affairs and future of the province of Alberta is invited to attend and participate in the question period which will follow the talks.

Allen Howard
chairman
campus socreds

Pen pal sought

The Editor,

There's one thing our people must not forget. The Republic of Korea has emerged as a full-fledged member of the world community of free nations with great opportunities and equally great responsibilities from the substantial help of the United Nations and your country since our Korean War. It is a great pleasure for me to know about your country with a pen pal in this time.

I'll see that the happiest time in my life is the time when I read the letter from a nice girl and boy, the old and young of your country.

I am a self supporting student of 21.

Choi Duk Sun
P.O. Box NO88
Shu Dae Mun
Seoul, Korea

The computer will sock it to you — plenty

By PETER BOOTHROYD

Did you read the article on "the incredible school of the future" in Saturday's supplement to The Journal? The school of the future is to be thoroughly computerized and run according to the motto, "Technology, Flexibility, Individuality". The writer of the article has no doubts that computer gadgetry will enhance individuality in the education system. I'm not so sure.

According to the article, teachers will not be replaced. The teacher will still be needed for "soothing a sobbing six-year-old", giving "commendation and encouragement", and "will become what he should have been all along—the scout, the guide, to whom the young explorer will turn voluntarily for assistance." This is good. Using computers so that teachers can be freed to do these important things is wonderful. But look at what the computers are seen as doing: "Out of the recesses of its memory storage bank, the

computer tutor has assembled a fairly intimate profile of Jane." The computer apparently will know that Jane is weak in Canadian history, will be able to present "mathematical problems uniquely programmed for her rate of progress," and will offer recommendations to help her improve a subject in which she is doing "badly".

This raises the question of who decides what is weakness in Canadian history, what Jane's proper rate of progress is and what doing badly in a subject means. If it's her teachers, then that's nothing new, and it's hard to see how the computer will improve things. It might not make them any worse, but that's nothing to rave about. What is more likely is that it will be one of the hacks working for IBM or some other computer company who makes the decisions—just as today it's the hacks working for the book companies who determine through their textbooks what we should learn and through their multiple choice question

booklets (or "teachers' guides") where we are weak.

Let's not be naive about this. The computer companies aren't inventing all these wonderful things for the schools because they believe in community service. They are going to make lots of money. Just like today the book companies make most of their money from textbooks. The computer companies love seeing all those computers being bought for the school—not only for the immediate project but because it means the schools will have to buy the programs into which Jane's "intimate profile" can be plugged.

Cynical as I am about the motives of the computer companies and the purpose to which their products will be put, I think there are ways in which the computer and other new machines can be used for the advantage of all. Movies and lectures could be filed on some computerized system to be recalled when the student feels he wants them. This would be

very simply, an advanced audio-visual library.

At the university level, technology could be employed in such a way that scheduled lectures would be mostly obsolete, for a student could hear a lecture on any topic any time he wanted by experts in the field. The teacher could be saved the drudgery of lecturing and could spend the time saved in creative dialogue with the students.

Unfortunately, it doesn't seem to be going that way. Last year I found my way into a conference on the use of media in the classroom. An expert from the United States (where else?) came with a bunch of slides and gave a clever lecture in which he pointed out that anybody who opposed the use of televised lectures was like the Pope who condemned Galileo.

It is, by the way, significant that students were not invited to this conference. The organizers didn't feel it to be a topic which should interest students. The as-

sumption that teacher knows best and that students should learn what he knows was implicit not only in the message of the conference, but in the procedure as well.

No matter what the magazines say, there are choices to be made about the shape of the future school. Technological innovations can be used or discarded, and if they're used it can be one way or another. The guys who make the machines don't like to talk about these kinds of alternatives, because there's one that's best for their business. But as university students, we should think about these things and work toward a use of the technology which really does ensure "individuality". Granted that it's hard when the administration organizes meetings on these questions and doesn't invite us, but that's typical. Perhaps as we get some kind of meaningful representation on the university's decision-making bodies, we will be granted the right to discuss our future.