



"All right, all right! I promise you you'll have a bigger say in running the flock"

### Rights protected?

## Confidential information released to employers

The Editor;

Over a number of years a large body of personal information about an individual is obtained by university administration. Just how confidential is this information?

It has come to my attention, quite by accident that the Faculty of Education and the Edmonton Public School Board have violated my rights with respect to student teaching. It was my understanding that information regarding performance during student teaching would not be given to anyone without my written permission.

In an interview with the EPSB, no reference what so ever was made to my student teaching, nor was I asked to sign a release form permitting this Board to obtain such confidential information.

During a review of my student teaching performance with my

faculty consultant, it was discovered that my evaluation cards were missing. A check with the Field Experiences Office revealed that my cards had been pulled and set aside for a personnel officer of the EPSB.

On what or whose authority did the EPSB act? Certainly not mine. Or, for that matter, what promoted the Faculty of Education to allow this to happen?

Are my rights being protected, or is confidential just another word.

It is my suggestion that the Student Grievance Committee conduct an investigation into this matter. Perhaps others have had their rights abused unknowingly.

Ellory Yurchuk  
ed ad 1

PS: As a result, I have withdrawn my application from the Edmonton Public School Board.

## Why are the professors being refused tenure?

The Editor;

Since the beginning of the academic year the Department of Sociology has been in constant turmoil. However, the activities of the staff reached a high point of irrationality and vindictiveness in the recent recommendation that Professor Fisher not be considered for tenure and Professor Whiteside be dismissed. These two professors are not only professionally competent, but are particularly dedicated to their students and are well thought of.

Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, they have never used their classes for the purpose of trying to influence (or intimidate) their students, as some of the

other staff have done, by expressing their personal opinions about departmental affairs. In view of these factors about Professors Fisher and Whiteside, it seems extraordinary that a negative recommendation has been made.

The constant turmoil this year has reduced the effectiveness of the staff. This latest piece of folly has the further consequence of eliminating most of our best qualified professors. Even worse, the department will lose those people who seem most concerned with the ethical standards within the department.

Rebecca A. Hoover  
graduate student  
sociology

## This is page FIVE

## Beware of labels they can be meaningless

The Editor;

Everywhere nowadays we hear words like socialist, capitalist, communist, reactionary, democrat, etc. banded around on campus but they seem to mean different things to different people. It is suggested that we should judge a procedure, system, etc. on its merits, not on its label.

For instance, it is being advocated in certain quarters that the so-called "capitalist" system of Canada be done away with. Are the so-called "radicals" who are advocating this sure that this is really what they want? Perhaps it is *extension* of the system to include the one-fifth (approximately) who are at present poor and under-privileged that is needed more than its abolition. Some time ago the leader of the so-called Progressive Conservative party was speaking in favour of a guaranteed income for everyone. This is what the Socialists in many other parts of the world have been advocating for a long time; but their system very often does not allow them to afford it. The present Canadian system may be able to afford it because, for instance, after taxable earnings of \$400,000, more than 80 per cent of the remainder is taken away in the form of income tax. It is noteworthy that when, not so long ago, income tax was first advocated, it was violently objected to by many and labelled as rampant socialism.

Another illustration can be given by the fact that the so-called conservative students of The University of Alberta here already got more student representation, from Board of Governor down to faculty committees, than most if not all other universities in Canada. The classical

retort to this by the all or nothing "activist" is that such representation is just tokenism. Here again one can be confused by labels. What one may call "tokenism" another may call "the thin edge of the wedge". Many drastic functional changes started by inserting the thin edge of a wedge.

All systems have their injustices. We are in favour of fighting injustices and inequities wherever they exist. One method of positioning oneself for doing this, which is worthy of consideration, is advocated by Hoving in the February 1966 issue of *Pace*.

*I'll give you Hoving's Law. Fight, challenge and struggle, but—this is the subparagraph of the Law and very important—become the Establishment and beat the Establishment at its own game; not by attacks and constant criticisms or abrasive chatter all the time but by getting into the Establishment and changing it. Make yourself indispensable to the Establishment. Know all about it, every rule, every law, every single one of the parliamentary procedures. Persuade, cajole and work partly in silence, partly in full outcry. Once you are in there with them and the door is closed behind you, learn the business, its strengths and its weaknesses. Then make the changes.*

A sure way of *not* fighting injustices and inequities effectively is to abuse and obstruct those who, however "slowly", are.

C. A. S. Hyman  
Associate Professor of  
Sociology and Agricultural  
Economics

## Are the SDU really SAU?

The Editor;

How can we reconcile the observations that the Students for a Democratic university appeared at the election rally bearing the "black and red flags of anarchy and revolution"? (Gateway, February 20, p. 3.)

Democracy or anarchy, which do they espouse? Is this another example of illogical and inconsistent thinking that has appeared so frequently in recent months? Or is it an intentional effort to confuse? Perhaps the group needs to redefine its objectives (assuming they were ever defined) or rename itself Students for an Anarchical University.

J. A. Robertson, Ph.D., P.Ag.,  
Associate Professor of Soil  
Science

## Afterthoughts of a campaign

The Editor;

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the kind people who worked on my campaign and those who voted for me in the past election. It was a pleasure meeting so many students on campus and talking to them about student politics. It was a great experience and there was too much gained to be disappointed.

My opponent, Liz Law provided me with a fine example of how to run an effective campaign that had all the principles of integrity and efficiency. I wish her the best of luck in her role of Vice-President of Academic Affairs.

But The Gateway ran a shitty campaign to inform the students on campus. It lacked depth, and in general conducted itself like another Edmonton Journal. Hats off to you for trying to sell a free newspaper and not educate your readers.

Not until the next election but throughout the year,

Earl Silver