

Viewpoint

Heads and politics don't mix

When the use of hallucinogenic drugs began to mushroom several years ago it was assumed in many circles that within a short time such chemicals would be legalized.

"They won't continue to bust people", the argument went, "when they find that they are sending the sons and daughters of judges and lawyers to jail."

That was several years ago. Since then, several thousand young Canadians have been thrown in jail for possessing or trafficking in hallucinogenic drugs. The penalties for these "crimes" have risen, not fallen, and recently a number of drugs (including mescaline) were reclassified to make merely simple possession illegal.

The argument on the inevitability of legalization is still commonplace, but it has lost much of its plausibility in the light of events of the past few years.

To radicals, the explanation for persecution of drug users and "hippies" was obvious. While dope, in and of itself, is value-free, the life-style which tends to accompany drug use in North America is subversive with regard to certain values which are basic to the maintenance of a post-industrial bureaucratic system. Thus, while drugs are not necessarily a revolutionary phenomena, their use in North America today has

an implicit revolutionary significance.

Most heads would, of course, take violent exception to the latter statements.

The myth of "hippie" still dominates the consciousness of most of the drug subculture, and being apolitical is a central theme of that myth. Certainly the lifestyle is a very attractive one. The question to be asked, however, is can you live that life style without getting stomped by society? In the face of rising crackdowns on dope just about everywhere, it seems unlikely. Why not?

The central struggle going on in our society is between radicals of a thousand different types and a nebulous but very real establishment. The primary weapon of that establishment is the police who have been aimed primarily at heads and radicals in recent times.

What is significant is the reason given by the establishment for the persecution of heads. Almost without exception, police chiefs state that drug use is a central factor in the attack on what they perceive as the good in North American civilization. At all the much-publicized drug conferences, at least one sixty-year-old red-neck police chief stands up and rants about "drug-taking hippies and radicals". Everyone except heads realizes that dope is subversive.

The point is: there is a struggle going on and

heads are in the middle where they can't get out. They have two options: they can figure out who persecutes them and why and how to fight back; or they can sit around doing nothing and have their minds eroded by paranoia and their bodies by police boots.

It is unfortunate that this choice is being forced upon heads. They have already made a fantastic positive contribution to the revolution by providing the outlines of a valid and authentic post-revolutionary lifestyle. It would be nice if they could "live in peace" now, but they can't.

This may be why heads have a lot of hostility toward radicals. Let's face it, radicals are on a heavy trip and no one likes being forced onto the side of a group they don't agree with.

As a matter of fact, apolitical heads may have one other option besides the two already mentioned. They could try to convince the "establishment" that they are not a threat and in fact are on the "establishment's" side. It wouldn't work, but they could try—if they really want to.

*"Choose your weapons
Guns or flowers
Flowers shoot rotten bullets
Guns make lousy flowerpots."*

—Digger poem

Which way sociology?

By G. LLEWELLYN WATSON

It has been suggested that many top quality graduate students have withdrawn from academic social science claiming to have found more obfuscation than clarification, more artificially departmentalised knowledge of the embalmed past than a unified grasp of the living present.

Sociology is the principal culprit in this scourge. One might well ask, for instance, how the graduate school at the U of A intends to answer these charges. What do we need in the discipline—action research, applied research, social engineering or "pure" research? Or will we rely solely on experimental and quantitative techniques and adopt simple mechanistic models?

The truth of the matter is that much of the so-called modern sociology kills the sociological promise in the womb.

So many of the ossified schools turn out neurotics and technicians rather than men with cumulative knowledge about social systems. They are thus because they have gone through a crazy system of "training" and have been subjected to moronic examinations which look back to the nineteenth century.

What examinations test is not only presence of mind, powers of recall and sense of relevance, but also moral stamina and nervous energy; and people shouldn't have to come to graduate school to have these tested.

The bad examinee (it is sometimes severely said) is unfit for life.

That examinations inhibit reflection and fresh thought—that examination answers are often clumsily adapted versions of rehearsed work and technical exercises, apt to be confined to the repetition of procedures and drills, never seems to bother professors. This is frightfully serious intellectual default.

No wonder the sociologist when he enters the real world often has fun poked at him, is labeled redundant or useless. We are not to expect the emergence of a sociological Newton, but sociology will never produce more than journal

article after weary journal article in which yet another correlation is tested and discarded—unless it can be made to see that the present focus will hardly help us to make sense of our time.

Subjecting graduate students in the 1970s to examinations which test absolutely nothing is like fitting an internal combustion engine to an old stage coach. It would be foolish to suppose that sociologists can discover laws which will determine human behavior, for the sociologist with his handbook of conflict resolution may be blown up with the rest of us if the politician miscalculates.

We might indeed be blown up sooner rather than later if as students of society we help to strangle fresh thought in our universities

Which way sociology for the 70's?

They were a savage audience

The Editor:

I would like to extend my congratulations to the groups sponsoring the appearance of Miss Kahn-Tineta Horn in the SUB theater September 11—IFC, FIW, and the Forums Committee. The evening performance was a classic of a kind.

After specifically terming the program a "panel discussion" and not a debate, after specifically soliciting agreement from the audience to ask short questions and to refrain from *ad hominem* attacks upon individual panelists, the moderator permitted the questioners to verbally abuse and harangue their guest, Miss Horn. Eventually the seemingly endless and hostile questions degenerated so badly that a young man in the front row called Miss Horn a "whore" and a "bitch" in a voice clearly audible to the panelists on stage.

A large number of native people attended this evening public gathering. Amid the hooting and shouting they must have gathered a sharper impression about student attitudes toward Indians if the evening's reception of Miss Horn

This is Page Five

This is still page five. Today, the FM² group claims radicals are on a heavy trip. An anthropology professor lambastes the uncivilized and intolerant reception accorded Kahn-Tineta Horn. A sociology prof takes her own swipes at the discipline and Eric Hameister poo-poo's unliberated "mothers".

They were a savage audience

is to be accepted as anything more than a post-registration psychodrama. Indeed, two native people were moved to speak out against the demonstration. Mrs. Caen Bly (editor of the *Kainah News* and granddaughter of Senator Jim-Gladstone) and Mr. Stan Daniels (President of the Alberta Metis Association and partly Iroquois himself) remonstrated strongly with the audience.

The fact that Miss Horn, a militant Indian rights advocate, exhibited little respect for her hostile evening audience did not absolve them from the responsibility for exhibiting something approximating civilized behavior. I would suggest, therefore, that those responsible for letting out the SUB theater in future investigate more intensively the character of the groups proposing to use the theater in order to insure that future university guests will not come to physical harm at the hands of unruly students.

Anthony D. Fisher
Associate Professor
Department of Anthropology

Some wise, some otherwise

By ERIC HAMEISTER

In the past four hours I have listened to so many comments on the birth control handbook that I feel that it's time to throw in my two bits.

The first thing that comes to mind is that the thing is turning people OFF. "Why?" I ask. "The pictures and material are provocative", it is suggested. It seems that someone's mother assumes that the pictures and material will turn her young innocent on and therefore mother is turned off.

It is thus that I learn that provocative means dirty and lewd. Fine. It strikes me that this is a source of fantastic insight into the thought processes of "mother".

Doesn't she trust her offspring's powers of will and discrimination, let alone good tastes? Or maybe hse just doesn't trust them at all. Too bad.

Consider the following words, sweetheart. It seems to be generally understood in this society that freedom of speech also means freedom to listen, i.e. freedom of information. Thus, I can hear, or read, what I want. It can be argued that there are limits such as "matters of national security" but this is sort of a limited argument.

The argument for restriction of information becomes a little dodgy when we are talking about something like birth control. What we are talking about here is one of the most private parts of an individual's life (no pun intended).

The sexual destiny of the individual is not something to be dictated by other people.

But this is what the withholding of birth control information is. It says that if "daughter" chooses to engage in sexual intercourse, and

many do, then fear and ignorance and maybe babies are her lot.

If men and women choose to engage in sexual intercourse without benefit of clergy or pill but in full knowledge of birth control this is a decision of their own making.

The consequences are their own responsibility.

But if they engage in these activities and do so in fear and ignorance, then the withholding of this information can only be regarded as criminal.

Mother is going to have to realize that daughter either is at the age of consent, or if she is not may consent anyway.

It is my considered opinion that "mother", in many cases, does not realize what she has taken upon herself. If she keeps "daughter" in ignorance then "mother" is responsible to a very large extent for what may happen because "daughter" is ignorant of certain very essential facts.

It's probably about time to extend the argument to include "father" too . . . if parents would face up to the facts of being parents, the necessity for this sort of information being distributed by the students' union would not occur. Unless I haven't heard, parents haven't abdicated their status.

Why, I ask, is this argument coming from "mother"? It's obvious that birth control information is needed and it is also obvious that "mother" just isn't coming through.

Unwed motherhood is not the "just deserts of the wicked". It's just tragedy, and plainly doesn't have to happen.

Man has the capacity to be a god . . . but more on that next week (or maybe even next issue).

Don't forget The Gateway

— 30 — Conference