

Casserole editing takes the significance out of article

I am writing to protest against editing of the sort done on my article which appeared in Casserole on Friday, Oct. 24, 1969, under the title (not my own) "A simplistic analysis supporting the enemy." I have two specific complaints. Firstly, the title given by the Casserole staff was enough to label the article as a piece of establishment conservatism without ever having to read one line. The original title on the draft I submitted was "This too is True" and I would be interested in hearing the rationale that went into the change. It would also be of interest to know whether or not the title would have been changed if the article had supported the original feature "Then let them eat cake—and they did." Secondly, the entire conclusion of the article was completely deleted. For the benefit of your readers, the article should have ended in this fashion:

It seems to me that the radical or new left or whatever they are called had better quit whining and insulting everyone's intelligence with such simplistic

analyses and solutions. A few days ago opposite the Journal's editorial page, there was a feature on the bright young men of the Social Credit party. Among them was one John Barr of "Young Canadians for Freedom" notoriety in his undergraduate days at the University of Alberta. The new left could learn a valuable lesson from Mr. Barr, who is unfortunately implementing his ideas by using the existing power structure to his advantage. It is ironic that Mr. Barr who was regarded as a dangerous reactionary in his undergraduate days is having his ideas implemented while the admirable left who were crying so copiously at that time are still whining but accomplishing little or nothing. The only thing that is different is that people are rapidly losing patience with the bleeding hearts of the left. This too is true.

I have two major objections to the omission of the foregoing conclusion. Without it, the article lacks point, the entire piece was written

to make a valid point about the new or radical left. Without the conclusion, the point simply does not exist. Also, my own point of view is not revealed until the conclusion and without the knowledge that the writer too is of the left, the major thrust of the article as a whole is lost.

However, after talking to Mr. Jankowski, about these omissions, I am aware there is a much larger and more important issue at stake. The reasons given for the editing done were as follows. Firstly, there really wasn't enough room for the entire article. When you look at the page (C-2), you realize immediately that what this means is that Dr. R. C. Lindberg's advertisement is more important than ideas—a rather unusual notion for a paper that postures as the critic of the establishment! Secondly, Mr. Jankowski was rather worried that I had named a name—one Mr. John Barr. My God—since when has The Gateway developed such a delicate attitude with regard to naming names or do I just imagine that people like Wyman and Strom

are regularly cut to ribbons by the aforesaid press?

What really is the issue here—the real issue is **honest journalism**—a commodity hard to come by in Edmonton. It is a recurrent complaint that because we have only one newspaper, The Journal, we really are exposed to only one point of view. Anyone who has written to The Journal expressing notions contrary to Journal policy knows how very little chance there is of getting your ideas into print. Anyone who has submitted to The Journal and managed to get their article printed is also very well aware of The Journal's editing practices. The Gateway has traditionally set itself in opposition to the journalism practised by The Journal—it has prided itself on being a vehicle of free expression, a paper where ideas, not adverts were important; where thought-provoking articles, not one-sided biased presentations were the rule not the exception. Well, Gateway, it seems that you have feet of clay—you are only willing to print ideas presented in a thought-pro-

voking manner if they support the position you appear to be the mouthpiece for (i.e. you are a citadel of free expression, but only for the free expression of ideas spewed by the new or radical left). Are you afraid that people might read and agree with and perhaps support other ideas? Is this why you give such articles ridiculous titles which prevent people from reading further because they think they are going to encounter stereotyped slop? Is this why you edit every bit of significance from an article? I believe it is time for the new or radical left and its mouthpiece to search their own souls in order to determine whether they see the same rigidity, intolerance, hypocrisy and bias they purport to find in such overwhelming quantities in the society they criticize. Until your readers receive some answers concerning your journalistic policy, everything in The Gateway should be read with real reservation and always with the idea that at least half of the original article is perhaps left out.

Myrtice J. Baker
Gr. Studies—Ed. Fdns.

Gateway boobed

As president of the group that sponsored Mr. Real Caouette's Monday address at the university, I feel it incumbent on me to protest on his behalf the account of that meeting which appeared in The Gateway.

If the substance of the talk to the reporter was what he set down, I can only extend my pity to him. To the distortion of Mr. Caouette's remarks I am, through experience, sadly resigned. However, blatant misquotation is something that needs to be identified and objected to. Your man records that, 'Mr. Caouette's suggestion to "take away from the haves so as to give to the have nots," raised applause from the audience.'

Mr. Caouette's statement, which was taped by more than one individual, was as follows:

Some say let's reorganize our fiscality. Let's take something from the ones who have something so to give to those who have nothing. Let's take away from the haves so to give the have-nots. This would end in a system where we will not have any more haves and we'll have more and more have-nots.

Applause followed.

Reporting of so shoddy a nature indicates that your reporter had no prior idea of the message which he was going to hear and, during the speech, had no interest in listening to what was being said.

Robert Klinck
President
Anti-Bolshevik Youth League

Safe cracking

Dear Mr. Leadbeater:

As a result of some defective equipment purchased by myself in the Student Union Building, my girlfriend is slightly pregnant. Since I bought and used Susafes in good faith, trusting that the students' union would not make available to its members anything which might be termed "substandard" I hold you, as the responsible party in our dilemma. Be assured you will be hearing from my lawyer (and from my girl's father).

Yrs truly,
George Stud-ent
arts 71

This is Page Five

It's anti-Gateway day in the old corral as the anti-Bolsheviks join forces with the anti-Casserolers and anti-editorial-and-column writers. Altogether they make a vicious army as they defend whatsoever things are good and right.

But don't despair, we've got lots of anti-other things letters too. Just thought we'd let us have it all in one blast.

A.S.A. goals too broad

Last Wednesday marked another attempt to establish an Arts Students' Association. Although the inaugural meeting was attended by some 500 students, I feel the association is doomed to failure like its predecessors.

I do not doubt the sincerity of the organizers but I think the association is attempting to accomplish things which other organizations could handle easier and more efficiently.

The organizers spoke of an organization that would co-ordinate the choosing of some 140 students to various Arts Faculty committees. Could this not be handled better at the departmental level? The organizers spoke of establishing a forums committee to bring in speakers, to hold teach-ins, to mobilize arts student opinion. What is wrong with the present Forums Committee?

The organizers spoke of abolishing tuition fees and getting involved in community problems. Is this not now being handled by the students' union?

In short, the association's objectives, though noble, are too broad to be of any use to arts students alone. Also, where does the money come from to finance such a grandiose affair?

A word of warning here. The more bureaucratic the system (i.e. the more committees and organizations that are created) the more alienated the student will become. The students' union with its million-dollar budget has enough problems trying to fight student apathy. What is needed is more participation for the good of all

students within the students' union organization. What is not needed is to fragment the student body still further into faculty interest groups.

Henry Dembicki
arts 3

Tampax ads

Okay Gateway, you want feedback:

It's a good try but I think you've lost something—I don't know what, but now I don't rush out to snatch a hot, wet copy off the stands, I wait to pick one off the floor in a classroom. Though not as bad as the bra and girle ads on the third page of The Journal, your Tampax sponge ads really leave something lacking.

Your relaxed style in the old Gateway with the knock 'em down, wring 'em out editorials, personal by-lines expressing opinions, and general cheek seems to be replaced by a far tighter, less personal attitude—and in an atmosphere of numbers and systems your warm, oddball non-conformity is sorely missed.

I guess people just can't get as much of themselves into an article with so many looming deadlines. I remain hopeful you'll come to some decision soon.

Zig
arts 2

Editor's note—Thanks Zig. Yours was our only letter on the daily. Why not zag in and work for us.

No four letter words!

One would think that students of this university would have enough intelligence not to use inappropriate slanderous words in an attempt to influence us emotionally to prove their point. If they can't appeal to me with reason then I would refer to them as unable individuals having no sound argument.

Certainly these students(?) should not need to be reminded year after year to refrain from these practices. Besides attributing a bad image to themselves and this university they are unjustly defaming our society as a whole.

This article was written in reference to the article found in Friday's Gateway entitled "Not Even Freeloaders" and numerous others guilty of this practice. Incidentally, the answer is not "Blowin' In the Wind."

Harold von Hacht
ed 2

I am writing in protest against your choice of words in the editorial "Not Even Freeloaders" (Oct. 31 issue).

If you can find no other way to say it "and still be in good conscience," don't say it!

Richard Martin
grad studies

As a student in my ninth year on this campus, I have had ample opportunity to observe the general quality of this newspaper. Without referring to the subject content of specific articles (that would require more than just a letter) it appears to me that this year some Gateway staff have been resorting more and more to common gutter terminology to achieve a certain aura of "sophistication."

The editorial of your Oct. 31 issue is a typical example.

In private discussion it is the privilege of anyone to use any "language" he or she considers appropriate, however in my opinion the same "terminology" in a newspaper is totally unwarranted and is certainly not a mark of good journalism.

I would like to think that most students at this university are mature, responsible adults who desire greater participation in the affairs of this institution and in the community outside it. It is unfortunate that The Gateway does not feel it necessary to lend credence to this image.

J. DeJong
grad studies

Editor's note—If the only things students will react to are year-books and four-letter words, we're in bad shape. These are the first letters reacting to any editorial, except for one complimentary one on the yearbook.

Down with drugs and stuff

Pigs! A very necessary portion of society, if we are to remain safe, has been abused and insulted to a point which is grossly unfair. The force is composed of men, normal living, breathing homosapiens, who are capable of blunders—a privilege granted many but seems to be begrudged them.

An article in Gateway by Dan Carroll left me stunned. I suppose Dan felt that drugs, including heroin, should be legal so that anyone could become a sick addict, let the pushers make their money. Drugs are an evil, they are crutches for people who are chicken to face reality. Take a look in any mental institution. A large number of cases, some irreversible, are kids

who blew their mind. It's a sad experience to see those mindless kids.

Perhaps Dan wants an anarchy such as the one that existed in Montreal for a short time. Theft, destruction, injuring others are perhaps approved by Dan—until he has some experience with the same.

In today's society, in any society where sick individuals—criminals—exist, policemen are necessary. Despite the seldom-found corruption that does at times exist in the forces, these men do deserve our respect and support.

T. Chrzanowski
arts 1