

They think, look and act alike

The Editor,

On page eight of Thursday, Oct. 3 issue of The Gateway, there appeared an advertisement for the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity. This ad recommended the fraternity for its "experience at moulding men" and quoted the recommendation of a little known, deceased US president, T. R. Marshall. (T. R. Marshall was born

I'm proud to be a member of . . .

The Editor,

The editorial of Thursday, Oct. 3, appears to have again missed the boat on CUS. The fact that our student government prefers to work within the structure on campus, but outside the structure of CUS is just acknowledging that CUS is dedicated to reform outside the structure of the university.

The stand is consistent with the conservative ideals that the majority of students here favor and I'm proud to be a member of a students' union so aligned.

Dave Chornell
Science

EDITOR'S NOTE—vast generalizations such as 'CUS is dedicated to reform outside the structure of the university' mean someone is not doing his homework and hasn't bothered to read CUS policy.

VOTE FRIDAY

Friday is voting day. Polls will be set up in the arts and the Tory buildings and will be open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

There are three candidates for arts rep on council

President of men's athletics has one nomination, hence, the candidate is in by acclamation.

Laura Fisher
arts 1

in 1854 and served as vice-president under President Woodrow Wilson, 1913-1921).

On the first page of the same issue is an article about students' council deliberating a "Student Bill of Rights". According to the article, one section of the "bill", dealing with radical, religious, or ethnic discrimination in student organizations, caused great concern to the council. This concern was due primarily to the fact that most, if not all, fraternities on the U of A campus employ discrimination as an essential criterion of existence.

The article states, "many councillors seemed to think that discrimination was the prerogative of the organization", and quotes the following question and answer from representatives at the meeting, "if the bill is passed, will there be no fraternities at the U of A?" The answer—"probably".

I imagine it is difficult to "mould" if every member doesn't think, look and act alike. This past week, the U of A campus had an example of how one prominent fraternity apparently thinks and acts. I refer to the Delta Upsilon (DU) poster to recruit new members. This poster used a picture duplicated from the advertisement for The Story of O, a book involving sexual fetishism and female servitude.

If fraternities cannot survive without corrupting human dignity—for example, the bigotry of discrimination—that is their problem, not that of student council. Particularly as student council claims to represent all students on this campus, regardless of their race, religion, or natural origin.

Perhaps more students should attend council meetings, just to find out if they are being represented.

This is page FIVE

Peter Boothroyd is finally getting around to the real problems confronting each student in university. His column, which appears every Thursday, deals this time with education in its most vital sense. He makes a clear distinction between training and education and all students can easily discover which they are getting at this university.

Letters come from lots of people and the letters concern the sexy poster which is really a fraternity ad, the politics in the yearbook, discrimination against foreign students (or lack of it) and our editorial.

Letters and articles should be brought to SUB 282. If mailed, they should be addressed to The Editor, The Gateway, University of Alberta etc.

We will not print pseudonyms. Letters should be less than 300 words.

—The Editor

He doesn't speak for all of us

The Editor,

I would like to point out that Mr. Benny Ling's letter (Oct. 1) did not represent the opinion of all, or even a small percentage of the foreign students on this campus. As a foreign student myself, I must do my Canadian friends justice by denouncing Mr. Ling's accusation on Canadians.

I do not believe 'outright discrimination, on the part of the Canadians' exists, at least not on this campus. If anyone has the misconception of being discriminated against, it is very likely the result of misunderstanding on his own part and over self-consciousness of being a foreigner. Very often he expects too much. He expects that Canadians will approach him, like asking him to go for a beer or inviting him to stay over for Christmas. If this does not happen he would think that they are not friendly enough.

But how often does he take the initiative? Very rarely, if ever. If he tries to ask them out to a movie or a football game, chances are that he will find out Canadians are not as cold as they appear to him.

It is true some foreign students are left out of the Canadian society. There are several good causes underlying this, like language difficulty and basic differences in customs. A Canadian going to a foreign country will have the same if not more serious difficulty as a student from that country will encounter in Canada. It is a grave mistake to attribute this problem to discrimination. From my experience in Canada I have reasons to like and be grateful to this country and her people. And there are many more like me.

Michael Lee
Graduate studies

Politics and the yearbook

The Editor,

I resent the fact that groups of a particular persuasion have been made to appear ridiculous in the '68 Evergreen and Gold. I refer to pages 38-39 and page 131 of said yearbook.

The mockery contained in these pages is contrary to the message of Mr. Sigler's editorial to the effect that the yearbook justifies its existence on its function of representing a "cross section" of the "social and scholastic" activities on this campus.

It is not reasonable to accept (or even express) the view that "local leftists" protest the war in Vietnam solely to provide "comic relief" for students' "mid October blues". The pretense at liberal humor on page 131 ought to be offensive to anyone (especially the liberal-minded). It makes me very angry.

It is worthwhile to note that the above examples, which are political statements of a strong nature, have been allowed to be published by the students' union, notwithstanding its policy of not issuing or making political statements.

I refer specifically to a statement by Marilyn Pilkington that the students' union must not and does not make political statements on behalf of the students of this university because it does not wish to violate the individual student's rights by making these statements on his behalf.

All students who are compulsory members of the union have an equal investment in the yearbook which is published to the tune of \$43,000. In view of this, it becomes necessary to make known that I dissociate myself from the political posture expressed in the '68 Evergreen and Gold.

Barbara Sundal

Don't give us degrees, give us an education

By PETER BOOTHROYD

The trouble with universities is that they issue degrees. It's not that they grant too many degrees, or that they grant too few, but that they make such awards at all.

The proper function of the university, surely, is to educate. The word "education" comes from the Latin *educere* which means to lead out. The very origin of the word implies that education is a process whereby a person becomes more open, more broadly aware. It means being freed of the suspicions which have been inculcated in us by the socialization mechanisms of society. In a positive sense, freedom also involves the ability to commit oneself to worthwhile tasks. Only institutions which have as their purpose freeing people should be called educational institutions.

The schools and universities do not, for the most part, have this purpose. At the lower levels they are directed toward socializing the child, i.e., teaching him to conform, which is the antithesis of education. At the higher levels, the high schools and universities concentrate on training the student, i.e., preparing him for a specific job. Getting an education means learning to think; getting trained means acquiring the skills of a certain occupation so that it is practised easily without thinking.

While it is clear that university faculties such as engineering, medi-

cine, etc., are specifically oriented to training rather than education, a few words need to be said about the arts faculty in this respect. While one would think that this faculty should be concerned with real education, by and large this is not the case.

In the first place, the orientation of most courses is toward training people in the skills of that discipline. (For instance, in most sociology courses, students learn the concepts and methods used by professional sociologists, but do not get a chance to consider the pressing issues of this society.)

In the second place, the rituals of meeting deadlines for term papers, and of mastering a given amount of subject matter by the date of the examination, is training for white collar jobs in the bureaucracies of corporations and government.

In the third place, the very concept of a "major" field of study, while liberally interpreted at The University of Alberta, indicates that people are supposed to go through university with a rather firm idea of what they are "going to do" when they graduate.

Employers require a BA for many jobs, and the reasons for this, I have been told, is not that the BA's know any more or are any smarter than people without degrees, but that they are more reliable. That is, they will do the job assigned in a technically innovative way, perhaps, but

never in a critical questioning way. "Good old Joe, you can always rely on him to do a solid job."

(Before going any further, I should state clearly that training is "a good thing". Untrained doctors and engineers would be a menace, unreliable administrators would be useless. But training is not a substitute for education, and the two processes should be kept conceptually distinct.)

What is unfortunate about this society is that while there are many places in which a person can be trained for a wide range of jobs, there are very few places where a person can become educated. In an institution devoted to education, a "free university", the individual would be encouraged to learn in his own way, at his own pace, what he considered important. Inevitably, many of the students would become psychologically free to develop a commitment to freeing others in society outside the university. This sentiment would be encouraged by all students and teachers, for universal freedom would be the institution's supreme value.

Standing as social critic and agent of social change, the free university would be in direct opposition to present universities which "serve society" by churning out technicians for the enterprises of the elite. So far as I know, there is only one free university in Canada: Rochdale College in Toronto.

You will agree, I think, that in order for people to become free from their prejudices and free to make commitments, i.e., in order for them to become educated, the environment in which they learn must be freeing and encouraging of independence. This condition is not met when students are evaluated in an invidious way. It is one thing for a person to say to another, "I think you're wrong for these reasons," or "have you considered what Mr. X has said about this?". But it is something else to say, "that paper is worth a B—" or "since you don't know enough of the prescribed subject matter you'll have to repeat the year."

Whereas to the ordinary person the first kind of comment will be seen as helpful and indicating enough respect to warrant a reply, the latter kind of comment, the evaluation mark, is threatening. Behavior which is seen as threatening leads to protecting one's self by enclosing it with defenses which means one stops growing. In short, the marking system prevents people from becoming free, from becoming educated.

There is only one reason for the marking system. It is to enable the school or university to determine, through whatever weird and wonderful formula it has devised, whether a person shall be granted certain certifications or not. That is to say

that the university degree, if it is to be worth anything to employers, requires some sort of marking system. Whatever its merits in certifying a person as trained, the degree prevents people from becoming educated.

The granting of degrees should be left to training institutions or institutions established specifically to ensure proper certification, such as the Canadian Medical Association, the Bar Association, etc. Corporations should be forced to run their own personnel office; the university should stop providing a free screening service for the Hudson's Bay Company, Imperial Oil, and the like. Whether a person could learn to be a doctor, lawyer, or administrator in a truly educational institution would be dependant on a number of factors.

The important thing is that if he were encouraged to become free, any formalized training, and especially any certification, would have to be conducted outside the institution.

Some will immediately say that the removal of pressure from the university would result in either deserted buildings as people left for places where they could get trained to have a well-paying job, or that the campus would become a haven of ne'er-do-wells and bums. Next week, I will address myself to these issues.