

EDITORIAL

Style over substance

The frustrating thing about the U.S. election results is that everyone already knows why Reagan won.

It has been heard so many times it seems trivial, but that doesn't make it any less true.

Plainly and simply, Ronnie just looks better on TV than Fritz does.

It is a sad but true fact that in American politics, image is more important than substance.

Despite Reagan's repeatedly demonstrated lack of understanding of the most important issues, Americans like him because he makes them feel good about themselves.

They like the reassuring, fatherly figure who comes into their living rooms every night.

Forget the fact that the rest of the world sees Reagan for exactly what he is: the rest of the world doesn't get to see him on television.

Americans, on the other hand, are fully capable of overlooking the fact that Reagan has a less than complete understanding of the nuclear arms issue.

They are capable of overlooking the fact that despite his rhetoric about reducing the size of government, U.S. budgets and the U.S. deficit are higher than ever, and U.S. trade policy is as protectionist as ever. (Just think - where would the American auto industry be without "voluntary" quotas on Japanese auto exports to the U.S.?)

They are capable of overlooking the fact that social programs have been cut, so that the defense and aerospace industries can be healthier than ever.

They are capable of overlooking Reagan's desire to escalate the arms race into outer space. (Excuse me for being naive, but wouldn't it be cheaper and less confrontational to negotiate a treaty with the Soviets, banning military activity in space?)

And do Americans seriously think the Soviets will become friendlier when Reagan makes comments like the one about leaving "Marxism-Leninism on the ash-heap of history"?

The fact is, Reagan has been willing to sacrifice his tough line with the Soviets in cases where it might have cost him votes.

Anyone remember the grain embargo and the MX missile?

Reagan's stance during the campaign was that he had no stance. The only concrete thing he stood for was "a better America".

Mondale, on the other hand, did take positions on several issues and clearly had a much better understanding of nuclear arms, but where did that get him?

One would like to think that Americans are aware of all this, but Tuesday's results make it difficult to accept that conclusion.

So that's about it. Reagan won because he looks good on television, and Mondale lost, just like Carter before him, because he looks like a wimp.

It certainly is a sad commentary on the American people. All one can say is that they deserve him: a plastic president for a plastic culture.

Kent Cochrane

Remembrance

Die to remember, that day in November
When bombs still burst in the air
Heavy with gas, and gangrene in dismembered
Friends, facing death with a stare.

Above those mud trenches, with weapons clasped tightly
Like lambs for the slaughter
Young heroes bled, and froze in those battles,
Of mist, artillery and clay.
Memories are few, midst the new generations
Of wars, of dread and fear
In silence, then, remember,
Those who gave their lives
That we might live instead.

John Algard

War would end if the dead could return

Stanley Baldwin

The possibility of war increases in direct proportion to the effectiveness of the instrument of war.

Norman Cousins

There are no warlike people - just warlike leaders.

Ralph Bunche

IT'S THE LATEST
ADVANCEMENT
IN MODERN
MEDICINE—
BABOON
LIMBS!



BECKERS-GATEWAY-84

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Will the real Lenin
please stand up?

"If the entire population of the earth must die in order to keep my friends rich, then I want a chance to piddle on their graves."

Winston S. Churchill

Is this a consequence of the low level of student literacy we hear so much about? If Blaine Manyuk (Engineering III) couldn't read my letter himself, he might have taken the trouble to find someone other than Ken Shipka to read it for him.

The latter individual already has a reputation for inventing ominous quotations and then charging them to the historical expense account of V.I. Lenin.

But now, in reading my letter to the gullible Mr. Manyuk, Shipka has apparently put his ridiculous words into my mouth as well.

One thing is clear: Mr. Shipka and his friends, like their Stalinist soul-mates, don't hesitate to invent facts or statements whenever the real ones fail to conform to their extravagant claims.

Andrew Rodomar
Arts III

Sex-busters proposal
receives cold shower

The only "major crisis facing the University" is prudes like Kitty Chan and Susan Richardson. What do these ladies suggest? A roving band of "sex-busters" to terminate over-amorous offenders? If they would spend half as much time studying as they do listening for imaginary "moans, groans and prolix

games" they would not find their "intellectual" concentration threatened.

If Ms. Chan and Ms. Richardson are disturbed by an isolated incident, a more immediate method to resolve the situation would be to approach the offenders and ask them politely to "put it back in their pants," instead of writing petty letters to the Gateway.

Besides, if these two innocent ladies are so self-righteous about the "epidemic proportions" of sexuality around the University, then how do they come to be so "aware" of the price of birth control pills?

Roger Osborne, Arts III
Steve Stauffer, Arts III

HFS exploits ignorance

With regards to the letter written by Don Kennedy and Mel Wirth.

It is good to see that there are, besides my room-mates and myself, some real men still around. I am referring, of course, to the difficulties between the Lister Hall Students Association [LHSA] and Housing and Food Services.

The complaints raised by the LHSA have remained constant (to recap): lack of communication, unilateral decision making, and lack of respect.

Why these complaints? Any why does Housing and Food do little about them? Simple, they do not have to.

Most students living in residence (save a few 'res rats') are first year students.

They are unsure of the way things were in previous years and thus are ignorant to the changes year in and year out.

So it is easy for Housing to make changes without consulting the LHSA.

What changes you ask? Services and using costs

The Gateway

November 8, 1984, Volume 75, No. 18

Editor in Chief: Gilbert Bouchard
News Editors: Suzette C. Chan, Neal Watson
Managing Editors: John Algard, Marie Clifford
Entertainment Editor: David Jordan
Sports Editor: Dean Bennett, Eva Pendzich
Photo Editors: Bill St. John, Tim Kubash
CUP-Advocate Editors: Ray Warnatsch
Denise Whalen
Production Editor: Brougham Deegan
Advertising: Tom Wright
Media Supervisor: Margriet Tilroe-West
Circulation: Paul Chu
Typesetting: Linda Derksen, Janine McDade

The Gateway is the newspaper of the University of Alberta students. Contents are the responsibility of the Editor-In-Chief. All opinions are signed by the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway. News copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. Newsroom: Rm 282 (ph. 432-5168). Advertising: Rm 256D (ph. 432-4241), Students Union Building, U of A, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G7. Readership is 25,000. The Gateway is a member of Canadian University Press.

Good grief! We're off to see the Wild West Show; with Jasper Jens Andersen; clever Kent Cochrane; wonderful Warren Opheim; dangerous Don Teplyske; happy Hans Beckers; shy Shane Berg; gregarious Greg Owens; rapid Ron Hackett; big Bill Doskoch; elegant Elizabeth Eid; fearless Doug Bird; jocular Geoffrey Jackson; Kevin Kaardal; Dave Boyd; Doug Olsen and Audrey Djuwita. Gillbey's back and we have to be polite this time...