

# Varsity Voices

## A Rebuttal

To The Editor:

Mr. Pitfield, the campus Liberal leader, in a statement to The Gateway last week on Model Parliament, made several assertions which, intentional or not, are untrue. Mr. Pitfield stated that he "received a written and signed guarantee from the leader of the NDP stating their eleven members would support the government on . . . a vote of confidence"—on certain conditions.

Mr. Pitfield should learn how to read.

It is true he has a note from me, which he received about two minutes before he dissolved the house. This was not a formal commitment of my party; as Mr. Pitfield knows I cannot commit my party on any major issue without consulting the members. I sent the note to Mr. Pitfield as a suggestion, for negotiation. I received a verbal (and somewhat confused) reply from him in the lobby half a minute later. I then brought the issue to my party inside the house. We took a vote, and the majority disagreed with my proposal to the Liberals and I was outvoted.

Mr. Pitfield seems to interpret the fact that my party presumed to disagree with both its leader (myself) and the Prime Minister (him) as a lack of principle.

I suggest it is nothing of the sort. Mr. Pitfield must know enough about the New Democratic Party to know that policy on major issues is formulated by the members, not dictated by the leader. This doesn't strike me as in the least bit a negation of principle, in fact just the opposite.

In conclusion I can only emphasize what I have said before. Regardless of the events leading up to the dissolution of the House, when Mr. Pitfield stood with the dissolution order in his hand in Model Parliament, he had a choice. The alternatives were dissolution or letting someone else take over the government, and having a successful Model Parliament.

Only he could make that choice, and no amount of intellectual squirming can shift the responsibility.

Robin Hunter

## Obstructionists

To The Editor:

As one of the Social Credit members who resigned from Model Parliament (Mon., Feb. 24/64), I believe it would be in order to explain the actions of the Secred members.

The speech from the Throne offered several important items worthy of discussion. Specifically, the Liberal government proposed to introduce measures to: end discrimination in employment; create the office of Ombudsman; lower the voting age to 18; introduce a further bursary plan for students; and other measures which deserved, if not the support, at least the serious consideration of all members. Our group wished to support these particular measures, and at the same time seek clarification of the Liberal ideological stand. We intended to criticize in a responsible manner—recognizing the amount of work and worthwhile bills in evidence.

Opposition members of the other three parties immediately proposed a motion of non-confidence in the minority Liberal government. They did so without grounds, calling for the question before debate had really begun. Leaders began to argue. Motions of non-confidence in the Speaker were voted upon, appealed, and re-appealed. The scene was one of useless, petty, and obstructionist tactics. It became evident that no business could be done, and little accomplished.

And so what could have been an airing of honest differences—an opportunity to debate relevant issues—turned into a farce. As members of a responsible campus party, we had no other choice but to express our dissatisfaction with the regrettable situation in which we found ourselves.

Owen Anderson

## Faulty Reasoning

To The Editor:

Mr. Cragg has presumably shown us an example of the thinking which has gone into the SUB expansion plans. It is not very impressive.

Mr. Cragg's reasoning re a referendum is especially curious. He and his apparently docile council reject the idea of a referendum because of the usual practical difficulties involved in its realization. Democratic process is always difficult, as we can see by our insufficient and despairing efforts to establish it in North America. But Mr. Cragg has a theoretically ideal electorate—more or less literate, supposedly thinking, etc. What has he to fear? We can only infer that he doubts the ability of his administration to convince the student body of the worth of its plans, in which case there can be a reasonable doubt about the wisdom of these proposals. Surely the body that elected Mr. Cragg to office can be given some say in the destination of an expenditure of nine millions of its funds.

In the area of possible alternative financial arrangements, Mr. Cragg is even less convincing. His sardonic *ad hominen* arguments against Mr. Gillespie tell us little of exactly what efforts have been made in this direction. And everyone will admit that his proposals as to a future vocation for Mr. Gillespie are absurd: if the office of Provincial Treasurer is open, the Premier will, as a matter of tradition, appoint himself to the post.

Robert Taylor

## To Scribes and Pharisees

To The Editor:

The latest fashion, or so it seems, is to wear the cloak of atheism, agnosticism, or even more recently, humanism. Judging (sorry if this is a touchy word) from recent Gateway discussion, the cloak they wear is in reality the garb of anti-christianity. Whether they realize it or not, this is their lot. By setting themselves against christianity they attempt to appear "modern" and "psychologically mature." They speak of new concepts, and high sounding nonsense, but theirs by choice is the path of pseudointellectualism. And as Adam Campbell so aptly stated, "so much knowledge, and so little wisdom."

Basically, humanism is one of the finest qualities a personality can portray. It has that enduring empathy and concern for its fellow man that makes all hearts happy. Certainly such a quality of mind and soul is the desire of all christians, and of all men of good will regardless of faith. Yet a certain peculiar crowd of characters claim to have a "corner on the market," and with the same breath they disclaim the actions of another, almost as peculiar group, for practising this same controversial discovery by calling them do-gooders.

Such a prostitution of a noble institution (real humanism) is escaping the reality of life; for it tends to smother itself with a meaningless way of life. You see, humanism per se, despite its earnest nature, does not go far enough in answering many of man's most difficult problems; it merely suffices our good will obsessive compulsiveness, and provides us with a skeleton frame-

work on how to pattern our lives.

Humanism in the modern sense is merely atheism or agnosticism put into a more palatable term. It is not to be confused with the true humanism.

Christianity, contrary to many men's popular misconception, does answer our most deep soul searching questions as well as actions among its followers. But to find the encouraging humanistic answer to your problems does not mean that you must sell your body and intellect to some PI in the sky, whereupon blind faith dissolves your worries. On the contrary, to understand and to live God's will takes more intelligent thought and dedication than most men are willing to muster, in fact, only a very few of the really great men in our history have ever overcome their own human weaknesses and walked the pathway of God. Jesus is the supreme example.

Among the atheists (the word agnostic and humanist is basically the same), there are three types. Those with a lack of conviction, those with conviction, and those that despise conviction. The mushy personalities with non conviction are like warm tap water; I spew them out. They deserve no further comment. The unique person who has honestly searched life's meaning and found not God, is a rare but convicted person (I haven't met one yet). The last destitute collection of spiritually starved souls have carelessly passed judgement on God-fearing people, and have sworn themselves to the downfall of God. These despairing crusaders are the ones we today applaud as moderns.

Having sought for the weaknesses in christians, and found no strength (they were not looking for it), they assume that christianity itself is ineffective. Yet they have not examined the truth and wisdom of the faith for themselves, and as a consequence they have been robbed of one of the greatest joys and rewards life can offer. Unfortunately God has favored a weak link to carry His glory, and man is not up to the task assigned. Yet in the light of man's actions, God is judged.

Omayya al Karmy recently said, "I came to University to hear true and intelligent thoughts and not to be battered by pathetic voices from the wilderness." Well, all of us have the desire to pathetically shout from our own wilderness, and we think we are intelligent, but if we are to find truth, we must search in no slack manner until we have escaped from the wilderness into light, and where there is light, there is God.

In His service  
Murray E. Allen

## Cato Censor

To The Editor:

Populus Albertaensis vero gaudet nos talem virum ut Colonel Fleming habere ab nos custodiendos ab inutilibus rebus sordidis imaginum moventium emittentiumque sonos quoniam apparet ut plebs ordinarius de praceptis moralibus male afficiatur si fabulam non concisam a consore istius sceleratissimi Thomasis Ioannis adspiciat. Itaque Colonel Fleming ne praceptis moralibus depravatis male de talibus rebus decernamus, officium gerendi se quasi conscientiam publicam in se recepit. Cuius igitur prudentiam mirandam qui res sordidas paene usquam invenire possit laudemus.

Cato Censor

Translation:

Let the people of Alberta rejoice that we have such a man as Colonel Fleming to protect us from the unnecessary vulgarity of current movies. It is obvious that the ordinary citizen would be adversely affected by the uncensored performance of that rake, Tom Jones. Colonel Fleming realizes that we must be protected from making the wrong moral decision

## Model Parliament stand defended, criticized; Campus critics nail Cragg, Col. Fleming, fraternities, and psuedo-intellecets.

in such matters, and has thus consented to act as the conscience of the people. Let us therefore laud the great sensitivity of this man, who can find vulgarity almost anywhere.

Judi Kales  
Arts III

## Share Facilities

To The Editor:

How can you have such integrity and still get along in this world? Every man has his pride! I believe I'll suggest to the administration that it try to buy The Gateway's silence with an ironic bribe. Maybe you won't be so quick to criticize the lavishness of our campus equipment once you yourself have tasted it.

The Gateway should share the facilities of the newest building on the campus. I know you'll be as impressed as I was. I refer, of course, to the new Commerce Building.

Gord Stills  
D. W. Griffen

## No Guts

To The Editor:

The students on this campus have no guts. If those mythical demonstrators had any backbone at all, the so-called telephone call from the Premier to the president of U of A would have made no difference. It seems that most of the students are content to pay the higher residence fees.

Tiger

## Fraternally Yours

To The Editor:

Are fraternities a good thing? Are fraternities made up of leaders or merely followers too weak to remain individual? Do these people band together because they are courageous or for courage?

Do they advocate social inequality and promote an elite group? Do such cliques breed broad-minded people or narrow-minded people?

Is brotherhood so shallow it can be bought, therefore open only to the economically well nourished?

Is fraternity charity work just a rational reason for justifying and perpetuating their existence?

Do all the people in a fraternity merit the prestige a little pin sug-

gests they have? Can these people seriously claim any other reason for joining other than to fulfill their security and security need?

Do they not depend on exclusiveness, for if they become inclusive they would dissolve? Is the conformity they require advantageous in promoting questioning intellects? And lastly, are superficial organizations such as these the benefit they claim to be to a university?

To deter discrimination on the campus I would be in favor of their abolition. If they are to continue purely as the social clubs they are, then this status only should be acknowledged and admitted to.

They are not based on any defensible idealism and freshmen should be given a more objective account of them when rushing season begins.

A.L.F.S.

## "Nonsense"

To The Editor:

What's all this nonsense about firing your eminence? We all know that Council—Cragg, Mac-Tavish and Expanding Ian were across town to see the Premier. Were they so enthralled with Social Credit philosophy that your editorials which said nothing new, or radical, bothered them?

Or did the other part of the whole provincial establishment want her name in print again? Or is this whole affair tied to campus politics in that the aspiring empirists (we all know who don't we?) would like to see someone a little more favorable to their views (i.e. the status quo if I am in power) holding the job of Gateway editor.

Yours till the Revolution,  
K. de Boos

## Bouquet

To The Editor:

Well done! Your informative article ". . . And Student Goof-Offs" was a masterpiece. It expressed, I'm sure, the view of thousands of students on campus. Those who have to toil, sacrifice and scrounge for their degrees know too well of those so-called "students" who are at university just for a good time. Let us hope that your revealing editorial will open a few "blinded" eyes.

Congratulations



Perhaps the most frightening aspect of Varsity Varieties was the Tarzan skit which the columnist for the Journal liked so well.

When Stocks and I conceived the plot we did not fully realize the implications which were brought out in it so neatly. Nor did Bill Somers when he wrote the music. Nor did Phil Silver when he directed the portion.

For the drama, a exercise in monotony, is nothing less than a terrifying appeal to the emotional in man and an engulfment of all his rational sensibilities.

Certainly as a satire on rock'n'roll the meaning of Tarzan is immediately apparent. The idea that jungle music can create an idol is rather funny. But the notion that the entire audience could be so swayed by the visual and aural appeal of the act to the point that it could forget the satirical aspect and just sit back and tap its feet while an orgy of primitivism is played out is not very funny.

Bill's music which is so very funny (a note and variations we called it during rehearsal) is, and he agrees, fascist music of the worst sort. Carl Orff would be proud of it. So we sat back and laughed at the audience which did not know what was happening to it, although the audience could laugh while it was going on.

Perhaps it is going too far to suggest, as I have in conversation, that the skit becomes a satire of the entire century if the audience is taken into account, but the absurd overtones of that particular skit are there for those who could step back from the action and look at what was happening to themselves.

Far too late we thought of incorporating a Brechtian commentator who could point a finger at the assembly and say: "Don't look at the action on the stage. Look at yourselves." And that is why I have written this column.